

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 06825659 7



ZHE
Chase



BAPTISMAL TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

BAPTISMAL TRACTS FOR THE TIMES:

THE

DESIGN OF BAPTISM,

VIEWED IN ITS RELATION TO THE CHRISTIAN LIFE;

By IRAH CHASE, D. D.

WITH

AN APPENDIX; TO WHICH ARE ADDED SEVERAL ARTICLES,

OCCASIONED BY

DR. ROBINSON'S LEXICON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT,
AND THE DOGMA OF BAPTISMAL
REGENERATION.

BOSTON:
GOULD AND LINCOLN,
59 WASHINGTON STREET.

1851.

H. S.

THE NEW ENGLAND
LIBRARY

281154

2

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1851, by

IRAH CHASE,

in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

CAMBRIDGE:

METCALF AND COMPANY,

PRINTERS TO THE UNIVERSITY.

P R E F A C E.

THE view here presented of the design of Baptism is one which has deeply impressed the mind of the writer. The years that have passed away since it was given, at Cambridge, September 27, 1828, as an introductory discourse before the Boston Association of Baptist Churches, have served to make the impression yet more deep. The considerations then urged not only continue in all their force, appealing to the understanding and to the heart, but they have gathered strength from recent events. and from the circumstances by which we are now surrounded. Heaven grant that their appeal may not be in vain!

Baptism is here viewed in its relation to the Christian life, not as being its source, but as being the divinely appointed, the suitable and most impressive acknowledgement of its source, and of the obligations that rest on every disciple of Christ. If the representation be found to accord with the Holy Scriptures, the reader's duty is plain. If there be any doubt in respect to such accordance, let the subject be examined seriously, and candidly, and thoroughly. We may hope to succeed, if, in a becoming spirit, we earnestly endeavor to ascertain what our Lord has taught, and what he requires. *The meek will he guide in judgment, and the meek will he teach his way.*

The notes in the Appendix have been revised, and some of them much enlarged.

Even where, for the entire satisfaction of some of the readers, it has been necessary to introduce ancient or foreign words, special care has been taken to make the whole argument easily intelligible to all.

In one of the great contests now agitating the Church of England, and awakening, in a remarkable degree, the attention of many in various countries, great prominence, it will be perceived, has been given to the authority of Irenæus. This, in the memorable trial before the Privy Council of the Queen, the Bishop of Exeter brings forward as a leading consideration. Perhaps the subsequent article on the expression alluded to, as used by Irenæus, will therefore be read with the greater interest.

Respecting the next three articles no remark seems to be required to show that they are timely. Their value will be manifest when they have been carefully read. It is no small pleasure to be able to present them to the Christian public.

The sketch relative to the dogma of Baptismal Regeneration, it is hoped, will furnish some *aids to reflection* on a subject not yet so fully understood by many sincere and devoted Christians as the interests of a pure Christianity demand. It has been drawn from authentic sources. The original Latin of most of these may be seen in Mansi's collection of Decrees, Bellarmine's chapter on the Effects of Baptism, and Augusti's edition of the Protestant Symbolical Books. The sketch might have been greatly extended; but it was not designed to be a complete discussion; and the proposed limits of these Baptismal Tracts for the Times had already been exceeded.

BOSTON, September 8, 1851.

C O N T E N T S.

THE DESIGN OF BAPTISM, VIEWED IN ITS RELATION TO THE CHRISTIAN LIFE	PAGES
The Introduction	1
The Subject stated	2
Baptism as administered by John	2-5
Baptism as administered to Christ	8-14
Baptism as instituted by Christ, and taught by his Apostles after they were fully illuminated	14-22
The Application	22-32
 APPENDIX	33-64
Proselyte Baptism	35-40
Josephus's Account of the Essenes	40, 41
Our being cleansed from Sin illustrated in Eph. v. 26	41-44
John's and the Christian Baptism	44-47
Baptism the Answer of a Good Conscience	47, 48
How we are buried with Christ	48-52
Clinical Baptism and Sprinkling	52-64
 THE MEANING OF IRENEUS IN THE PHRASE “ REGENERATED UNTO GOD ”	67-85
Introductory Remarks	67, 68
Christ the Source of Salvation to Mankind	69-75
Faith required	75-77
The Work of the Holy Spirit	77-84
Conclusion	85

REPRESENTATIONS CONCERNING BAPTISM, IN DR. ROBINSON'S LEXICON OF THE NEW TESTA- MENT	87-107
Excellences of the Lexicon	91
Like impartial History, a Lexicon should be free from any extraneous Bias	91, 92
Its Decisions are not final, but liable to an Appeal to the original Sources	92
Dr. Robinson's Definition of the Greek word <i>baptizo</i> not authorized by the original Passages to which he refers	93
'Those Passages explained	93-98
The alleged " <i>difficulty apparently insuperable in the scarcity of water</i> " at Jerusalem"	98-101
The transferring of the Greek verb in the earliest Latin Versions, <i>baptizo</i> , instead of translating it <i>immergo</i>	101, 102
"The Baptismal Fonts still found in Palestine," belong- ing "apparently to very early times," and only "four feet in diameter on the inside, and three feet nine inches deep"	102-104
The Phrase <i>much water</i> and <i>many waters</i> , in John iii. 23	104, 105
Excellences again adverted to. The Preface commended. The Grief of many expressed	106, 107
THE SUFFICIENCY OF WATER FOR BAPTIZING AT JERUSALEM, AND ELSEWHERE IN PALES- TINE, AS RECORDED IN THE NEW TESTA- MENT	109-161
Many Places in Palestine yet imperfectly explored, or imperfectly described	112
Secret Influence of preconceived Opinions	112, 113
Some of the Ancient Chroniclers	113-115
Supplies of Water at Jerusalem	115-117
Various Facilities for Baptism common to most Eastern Towns	117-120
Pools at Jerusalem	120
1. The Pool of Bethesda	120-123
2. The King's or Solomon's Pool	123-125

3. The Pool of Siloam, with its smaller Reservoir	125 - 128
4. The Old Pool, or the Upper Pool in the Highway of the Fuller's Field	128 - 130
5. The Pool of Hezekiah	131 - 133
6. The Lower Pool of Gihon	133, 136
Other Places: The Site of Bethabara and of Enon not precisely known	136
The Size of the Jordan	137, 138
Bethabara: The Point on the River, near this Place, where our Lord was baptized	138 - 146
Enon, situated on the Jordan	146 - 152
The Place where Philip baptized the Eunuch . .	152 - 161
Concluding Remark	161

A BRIEF STATEMENT OF THE BEST ESTAB-
LISHED RESULTS AT WHICH BIBLICAL INTER-
PRETERS HAVE ARRIVED RESPECTING INFANT
BAPTISM 163 - 180

Why the Writer mentions only a few Authorities .	165, 166
General Statement	167
The Remarks of Meyer	167 - 169
“ “ Olshausen	169
“ “ De Wette	169, 170
“ “ Neander	170 - 173
“ “ Rückert	173

A Portion of Error still retained by these distinguished
Interpreters 173 - 175

How this has occurred 175, 176

Explanation of 1 Cor. vii. 14 176 - 179

What is no longer a tenable Opinion at the Bar of Bib-
lical Criticism 179, 180

THE IMPORTANCE OF UNDERSTANDING THE DE-
SIGN OF BAPTISM, SUGGESTED IN A SKETCH
RELATIVE TO THE DOGMA OF BAPTISMAL
REGENERATION 181 - 194

Consequences of mistaking the Design of Baptism . . 183

Decree of Pope Clement V., in 1311	183, 184
Cardinal Bellarmine on the Effects of Baptism	184
The Roman Catechism	184
Luther and the Augsburg Confession of Faith	185, 186
The Helvetic or Swiss Confessions	186
The Genevan Catechism	186, 187
The French Reformed Confession	187
The Heidelberg Catechism	187
The Scotch Confession	187, 188
The Thirty-nine Articles, and the Formularies of the Church of England	188, 189
The Followers of Mr. Alexander Campbell	189
The Mormons	189
The Oxford Tractarians	189
Mr. Gorham and the Bishop of Exeter	189
The Decision of the Arches Court of Canterbury	189
Appeal: The Case before the Privy Council	189, 190
The Decision of the Privy Council	190-192
The Declaration of the Synod called together by the Bishop of Exeter	192, 193
A Learned Work on the Effects of Baptism in Infants	193, 194
Humiliating Considerations, and a Closing Reflection	194

THE

DESIGN OF BAPTISM,

VIEWED IN ITS RELATION TO

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE.

THE
DESIGN OF BAPTISM.

IN the history of our redemption, what event is it, my brethren, that holds the most prominent place? What is it that is the centre and soul of the system? It is the death of Christ. Remove this, and you tear from the heavens the sun of the new creation. It is this that was prefigured by sacrifices. It is this that prophecy foretold as the event on which nations should gaze with astonishment. It is this that has touched the hearts and awaked the songs of the redeemed on earth, and that will for ever fill heaven with admiration and praise. It is this that is the source of all our spiritual life. It associates with itself the most impressive truths; and it supplies us with the steadiest and the strongest motives to the performance of every Christian duty. Whatever, therefore,

the Holy Scriptures exhibit as adapted to impress this grand event upon our minds, cannot be a theme unworthy of our contemplation. May we all consider ourselves as standing near the cross and the grave of our Lord, and cherish those feelings only which we know that he will approve.

In the Epistle to the Romans, vi. 3, it is written: "KNOW YE NOT THAT SO MANY OF US AS WERE BAPTIZED INTO JESUS CHRIST, WERE BAPTIZED INTO HIS DEATH?"

The text manifestly alludes to the fact that BAPTISM IS AN EMBLEM OF THE DEATH AND RESURRECTION OF CHRIST, AS CONNECTED WITH THE STATE AND PROSPECTS OF THE BELIEVER; and thus it reminds us of the OBLIGATIONS OF THE BAPTIZED.

This ordinance, as administered by John to such as repented, was a divine institution, having reference to Christ and the remission of sins.

We have the testimony of Mark: "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God; as it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee. The voice of one

crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord; make his paths straight. John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." We have the testimony of Matthew: "Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan," that is, many from all parts, "and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." We have the testimony of Paul: "John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him who should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus."* We have the testimony of Josephus, the Jewish historian, which, so far as it goes, coincides remarkably with the Scriptural account. It reads thus: "Herod slew John that was called the Baptist, who was a good man; and who commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, both as to righteousness towards one another, and piety towards God, and so to come to baptism; for that the washing with water would be acceptable to him, if they made use of it, not in order to the putting away of some sins only, but for the purification of the body; supposing still that the soul

* Acts xix. 4.

was purified before by righteousness.”* We have the words of our Saviour himself, by which he confounded the captious Pharisees: “The baptism of John,—was it from heaven, or of men?” John, an Evangelist assures us, “was a man sent from God”; and, manifestly referring to God, he himself begins a declaration with the words, “He that sent me to baptize.”

From these testimonies, my brethren, it is evident that John was specially and divinely commissioned for his work; that he required of such as came to his baptism a previous change of character, a previous purification of soul; and that he directed them to the great object of Christian faith, “saying unto the people, that they should believe on him who should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus.”

In all these respects there was something new and peculiar. It was not an ablution prescribed in the law of Moses.† It was not one of the divers washings, or immersions, or bathings, that had been suggested by personal convenience, or dictated by Jewish scrupulosity, and had been received by tradition from the fathers. It was not the ceremony which, in that age, when the

* Antiq. B. XVIII. c. 5, § 2.

† Lev. xi. 32; xv. 11, 13.

Jews as a people were sunk under the dominion of a foreign power, seldom occurred,—an ablution of a heathen and his family upon becoming incorporated with the Jewish nation,—an ablution which Pharisaical notions of uncleanness may have added to the circumcision which God had commanded.* Nor was it that ablution or bathing which made a part of the process in admitting candidates into the Essean sect, a sort of Pharisees, and which was daily practised by its members; for that, though a thousand times more frequent than the ablution just mentioned, of circumcised heathen proselytes, was, like this, a mere human device, and performed by the subjects of it themselves. It was accompanied with no confession of sins; it spake of no remission; it cast no look of faith towards the great Messiah.†

Baptism, however, as administered by John, was easily associated with one idea, which, in a greater or less degree, was common to all the other ablutions known among the Jews,—the idea of purification. But the purification which it indicated was a purification, not from ceremonial nor imaginary uncleanness, but from sin;

* Note A.

† Note B.

supposing still, says Josephus, *that the soul was purified before by righteousness*. And here let us never forget, that, while John preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins, he associated this with believing on Christ, whom he denominates “the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world.” *

It was an acknowledged principle among the Jews, that new laws were to be introduced in the time and by the hand of the Messiah; and well it might be. For numerous predictions in the Old Testament represent him as the supreme lawgiver of his people. It was also a well-known truth, that he was to “save his people from their sins.” But how this was to be done was not distinctly perceived by most, even of his own disciples, till after his resurrection from the dead. And yet they had a saving faith in him. Yes; and at his command they partook of the emblems of his body broken and his blood shed as their spiritual sustenance; while, even amidst his explicit declarations, they had but a very indistinct idea of the matter, compared with that which was presented to their minds after his resurrection. Still the bread and

* John i. 29.

the wine were in fact, and in the view of Him who appointed them, emblems of all that the disciples afterwards, at the time of their greatest illumination, perceived them to indicate. In a manner somewhat similar, baptism was in fact, and in the view of Him who appointed it, an emblem of more than was clearly and distinctly perceived by all the baptized before the resurrection of Christ.

So, too, the import of that emblematical act which our Lord exhibited in washing the feet of his disciples, was not fully perceived at the time; and he said to Peter, "What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter." *

Before the resurrection of Christ, baptism, whether administered by his own disciples under his own eye, or by John, who continued to testify of him, and, as a faithful messenger, to promote his cause, was received because it was divinely commanded. It was understood in part, but not entirely. It was readily perceived to indicate a purification, a purification that was somehow connected with the coming of the Messiah, to whom the baptized were to yield themselves as confiding and obedient sub-

* John xiii. 7.

jects of his kingdom. But how this purification — this remission of sins — was connected with the Messiah, was to be developed after he had borne our sins in his own body on the tree, and had risen from the dead. “Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures, and said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name, among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.”* “And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature: he that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved.”†

There is another and a nearer view, my brethren, which it becomes us to take of this subject.

John, in obedience to the divine command, appeared on the banks of the Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins; for he knew that the Messiah was soon to be manifested. But who the individual was, he knew not. He had lived in retirement amidst

* Luke xxiv. 45–47.

† Mark xvi. 15, 16.

the seclusion of “the hill country.” From his childhood, he “was in the deserts till the day of his showing unto Israel.” He had, it would seem, no personal acquaintance with Jesus, who, after his early infancy, except an occasional visit to Jerusalem, passed his time, till he was thirty years of age, in a different part of Palestine, at Nazareth, in Galilee.

“Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John to be baptized of him. But John forbade him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?” If he had known Jesus at all, it is certain that he had not known him to be the Messiah. But now an intimation of the fact is given. The Holy One stands before him in mysterious meekness and majesty. John, under the influences of the Divine Spirit, feels an impression that it is indeed the Holy One; and, conscious of his own inferiority, he shrinks from the high service proposed. “Jesus, answering, said unto him, Suffer it to be so now; for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness,” — to perform every duty, every act that pertaineth to our stations. It is thine to baptize; it is mine to obey the counsel of God, and be baptized. Thou prophet of the

Highest, sent to prepare my way,— I come to do my Father's will.

Then he complied. It was a peculiar case; and it was met in a correspondent manner. Of Christ was required no repentance, no confessing of sins, no faith in him who was to come. For he it was himself. He was holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners. It was himself who was to suffer, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God. It was himself through whom, at length, as having suffered, died, and risen from the grave, repentance and remission of sins were to be preached among all nations.

No matter whether John fully understood all this or not. He that sent him to baptize understood it all. And the Saviour himself, who was now entering publicly upon the great work which involved his death for the remission of sins and his rising again for our justification, understood it all.

John heard the expression of his will, and reverently acquiesced. It was a moment of profound and impressive silence. It was the moment of our Saviour's openly giving himself up to the work of our redemption; not to the Le-

ritical priesthood, for he was not a priest after the order of Aaron;* nor to the office merely of a public teacher, for in order to enter on such an office, neither Scripture nor usage required the baptism; but to his own peculiar office, the most prominent part of which was the laying down of his life and taking it again, that we might be purified from our iniquities. Thus, besides sanctioning baptism by his example, he was consecrated and sent forth into the world.

“And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water; and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him. And lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.”†

Can you doubt, my brethren, why he was so signally announced to the world as the *beloved Son*, at his baptism? Hear his own words: “Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life that I might take it again.”‡ So, on the mount of transfiguration, when Moses and Elias appeared in their glory and con-

* Heb. vii. 11.

† Matt. iii. 16, 17.

‡ John x. 17.

versed with him concerning “his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem,” “a bright cloud overshadowed them; and behold, a voice out of the cloud, which said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.”*

Knowing, as he did, at the time of his baptism, the sufferings which were connected with the work on which he was entering, and that they were requisite to our being cleansed from sin, he shrunk not back. In his own view and in the view of Heaven, his being baptized was a fit and striking emblematical declaration of his voluntarily yielding himself up to those sufferings, with the confidence of emerging. To represent one as overwhelmed in water was a well-known figure indicating deep afflictions. In the forty-second Psalm, the afflicted David cries, “O my God, my soul is cast down within me. All thy waves and thy billows are gone over me.” The same language is heard also in the sixty-ninth: “I am come into deep waters, where the floods overflow me.”

Thus our Saviour associated in his own mind the idea of his sufferings with that of our being cleansed from sin; and in due time he took care

* Matt. xvii. 5; Luke ix. 31.

to have these ideas associated in the minds of his disciples. Even previously to his final sufferings, (availing himself of the different senses of the same word as applied to different subjects,) he observes, in his ever-memorable prayer just before his being betrayed, "For their sakes I sanctify myself," or give myself up to my work, and offer myself a sacrifice, "that they also may be sanctified," or that they, having a sacrifice offered for them, may be cleansed, "through thy truth." * The import of this passage cannot be mistaken, when we remember the declaration of Paul in the Epistle to the Ephesians: "Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it, like the washing of water, by the word." †

In both of these passages, as well as in many others, we are taught that our being cleansed from sin is most closely connected with the sufferings of our Lord.

Of these sufferings, as well as of the cleansing, baptism, we have seen, was a lively emblem. Is there one in this assembly who can doubt it? Then let him hear the words of our Lord himself, as recorded by Matthew and by Mark,

* John xvii. 19.

† Eph. v. 26. Note C.

where, alluding most clearly to his sufferings, he asks: “Are ye able to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?” and in the twelfth chapter of Luke,* where also he most clearly represents his sufferings as a baptism: “I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!”

The appearing of John was the beginning of the new state of things, connected with the coming of the Messiah, or, as the Evangelist Mark expresses it, *The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ.*† Divinely commissioned, he came to make ready a people prepared for the Lord. He proclaimed the joyous tidings of the Messiah’s approach; and he baptized the penitent, teaching them to trust in the coming Redeemer. The Redeemer came. He sanctioned what had been done; and he authorized his disciples to continue the work. He shed new light upon the spiritual nature of his kingdom. On the evening before his crucifixion, he ordained a commemoration, that was to be often repeated, of his giving his broken body and his gushing blood to be, as it were, the food which should

* Verse 50.

† Note D.

nourish and sustain such as should be born into his spiritual kingdom. But did he abrogate that emblem which refers our very existence as Christians, our very birth into his spiritual kingdom, to his dying and rising again? No. But, after his triumphant resurrection, he adapted the style of this emblem to that full display of his character which it was then expedient to make. He gave to his ministers their final commission, in which he commanded them to baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,—of the Father, who so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son; of the Son, who gave up himself, the just for the unjust; and of the Holy Ghost, who, through the proclamation of the truth exhibiting Christ and him crucified, regenerates and sanctifies our souls. At the same time, he commanded them to remain at Jerusalem till they were endued with power from on high. He ascended to heaven. On the day of Pentecost, the Holy Spirit came down, and his energies were manifested in the conversion of thousands. “And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved.”*

* Acts ii. 47.

Here, in the history of the disciples, the word *church* first occurs; for here a church of Christ is first exhibited to the world as distinctly organized, and, amidst special manifestations of the Divine power, maintaining his doctrine and his ordinances. The dawn of the Christian dispensation had been beheld in the reformation of which John was the honored instrument. The light which then began to gladden the hearts and to guide the steps of the pious, had been true and evangelic. The darkness had been rapidly, though gradually, passing away; and now the church, like the risen sun, was seen in her full glory. Now the apostles were illuminated by that Spirit which the Saviour had promised, as about to come, and guide them into all the truth.*

Now, then, concerning baptism we may confidently receive their representations, as exhibiting, truly and faithfully, the mind of our Lord.

They represent us as being by nature dead *in* sin, polluted,— but by grace dead *to* sin, and hence putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, putting off “the old man which is corrupt.”† They represent us as thus cleansed from that

* John xvi. 13.

† Eph. iv. 22.

corruption of our former, our unrenewed state, and, when we put off, and as it were deposited, the old man, the body of sinful propensities, coming forth new creatures, beginning a new, a holy life, and cherishing the hope of life eternal. Of this they represent baptism as the emblem. And, my brethren, they represent it as also the emblem of what stands — and God grant that in our minds it may for ever stand — in most endearing connection with our new birth and our hopes of a glorious resurrection. Need I mention what it is to which I allude ? “ Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death ? Therefore,” continues the Apostle, “ therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death ; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin. Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him, knowing that Christ, being raised from the dead, dieth no more.”

In the Epistle to the Colossians, Paul, alluding to the Author of our salvation, says, *In whom ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands,—ye are characterized by that spiritual operation which consists in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ,* — the circumcision which Christ requires, the belonging indeed to his people through faith; for intimating which there is a well-known observance to which ye have attended: “Buried with him in baptism, wherein (in which emblem) also ye are risen with him through faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead. And you being dead in your sins, and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses.”*

Here it is manifest that the Apostle associates our being quickened, or rising to a holy life, with Christ’s rising from the grave. He represents it as closely connected with the death on the cross, and as implying our confidence in the revelation which has been made of the Divine power and goodness, — our confidence in the suffering and rising Saviour. And he reminds us of the source

* Col. ii. 11 - 13.

of all our hopes by reminding us of the significant and solemn act by which we publicly devoted ourselves to that Saviour, being “buried with him in baptism.” In our text, also, the impressive interrogatory is uttered, as concerning a matter of which no Christian could be ignorant: *Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death?*

In like manner,—after alluding to the time when “all the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened”; when overwhelming torrents from above were descending, and all the waters of the flood were

Rolling round a buried world,

and yet the ark was lifted up, emerging so as to be safe,—the Apostle Peter mentions the eight persons who were in it as being *saved by water*; *the like figure whereunto*, or somewhat as *even baptism doth now save us, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh*, not a mere external washing, unconnected with faith in Christ, *but the answer of a good conscience toward God*, the profession of a conscience made tranquil towards God
THROUGH THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST,

*who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God.**

To acknowledge the resurrection of Christ was, of course, to acknowledge his death as exhibited in the gospel. It was indeed to acknowledge the very seal of divinity, instamped upon his mission. To be influenced properly by this, was to be influenced by the whole system of evangelical truth. It was to stand on an eminence from which the confiding disciple beheld, on the one hand, the sufferings of Christ, and on the other, the glory that should follow,—on the one hand, the grave and the cross, and on the other, the Messiah's exaltation to the right hand of the Father, his power to “ save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him ”; † the deliverance of an innumerable multitude of believers from the bondage of sin ; the raising of them up gloriously at the last day ; the adoration of all the holy in heaven, and the hallelujahs of the redeemed for ever and ever.

Well might an Apostle exclaim, with an overflowing heart, “ Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a

* 1 Pet. iii. 21, 22. Note E.

† Heb. vii. 25.

lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead ;— who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness.” *

I need not inform you, my brethren, that in baptism there is retained, in all its significancy, the idea of cleansing or purification. For the water in which we are buried is a purifying element. Thus there is a figurative washing away of sins, a putting off of the body of sinful propensities, and, as it were, a depositing of it in the grave, from which, in this emblem, we come forth as alive from the dead, to “ walk in newness of life,” and at length to enter on the life everlasting, “as Christ was raised up from the dead,” after his having voluntarily endured those sufferings by which, we humbly trust, we have been delivered from eternal death.

In the Lord’s supper, there is a twofold reference. The bread and wine are to remind us, not only of *Christ crucified*, but also of *our being spiritually fed and sustained* by his body and blood. So in baptism, there is a twofold reference ;— the one, to the death and resurrection of Christ ; the other, to the state and prospects of

* 1 Pet. i. 3; ii. 24.

the believer, as connected with that death and resurrection.

This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ, — came, introducing with heavenly authority, by his harbinger, and by his Apostles, a baptism that testifies of him as the Saviour, and exhibiting, in close connection with this, his sufferings, even the shedding of his blood.* He has given not only the emblem, but also the reality. It is his blood that cleanses from all sin.† “Unto him that loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever, amen.”‡

It seems impossible, dear brethren, to enter into the spirit of the subject on which I have been addressing you, without feeling that

THE CONNECTION OF THE DEATH AND RESURRECTION OF CHRIST WITH OUR STATE AND PROSPECTS AS REPRESENTED IN OUR BAPTISM, OUGHT TO BE CONSTANTLY BORNE IN MIND.

You all recollect the manner in which Paul introduces the subject. He introduces it as pre-

* 1 John v. 6.

† 1 John i. 7.

‡ Rev. i. 5.

senting a most impressive practical lesson, a most powerful dissuasive from sin. What shall we say, then? he exclaims. Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein? *Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, or as his disciples, were baptized into his death,* or did by our baptism acknowledge his death as declared in the gospel, and, of course, all our obligations as well as hopes, connected with his laying down his life for us? And what is the grand obligation arising from his death as declared in the gospel? It is, *that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness.** “Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.”†

Behold the wisdom and the kindness of our Lord in appointing for us who have trusted in him a ceremony so significant as baptism, and so adapted to make on our minds an evangelic impression that shall never be forgotten. *He hath done all things well.* When I look into the

* 1 Pet. ii. 24.

† Note F.

Holy Scriptures, our great and only directory on this subject, all is lucid and impressive. But, alas! when I cast a look over Christendom; when I contemplate the history and the present state of this ordinance; when I think how sadly it has been perverted, and changed, and nullified, my heart sickens within me. O Thou who didst suffer for frail and erring mortals, and who didst say, *If ye love me, keep my commandments*, let heavenly love and light increase; let all who profess and call themselves Christians understand and do thy will.

It is our happiness, my brethren, to feel an unshaken confidence that we are standing on Scriptural ground. We have known our Master's will; and we have been baptized. We have found that his yoke is easy, and his burden is light. In obeying, we have had a sweet consciousness of his approbation. And when, from time to time, we have had occasion to gather around the baptismal waters, we have had some awakening of salutary recollections, some renewing of solemn vows, some increase of faith, some foretaste of the glory that shall be revealed. Happy, thrice happy would it be for our own souls, for the Church of God, for the honor of

our Lord in this ordinance, and for a perishing world, were we to recur constantly to first principles, and always bear in mind the OBLIGATIONS OF THE BAPTIZED.

I said, we have known our Master's will. Yes, brethren, we have known it. We have been convinced of its being his will, that we, being dead to sin, as he died a sacrifice for sin, should in our baptism acknowledge ourselves obligated to the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, to rise to a new and holy life, as he to whose sufferings we owe our deliverance from sin and condemnation rose from the dead, and as we hope for a glorious resurrection, when the trumpet of the archangel shall sound.

We have acknowledged our obligations. Heaven and earth have witnessed. Christians living in error on this subject, and attached, as men naturally are, to what has been handed down from their fathers, have marked us; and the men of the world have marked us. They have observed our lives. And have we never heard the keen reproach, What do ye more than others? Ah, my brethren! if it were only a slander, we could bear it. He who has loved us and died for us has taught us to endure patiently

the unfavorable opinions and representations of men. “Blessed are ye when men shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake.”* But when he himself,—our Lord and Master,—into whose death we have been baptized, casts on us the grieved and piercing look which he cast on Peter when he had denied him, and asks, What do ye more than others?—we can only go out and weep bitterly.

From his throne on high he looks down this day on all the baptized; he looks down on us; and he seems to say: ‘*I am he that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore.*’ To you I have given to know my will, and to hope for eternal life through my death. Into my death ye have been baptized. Created anew, ye have been set forth as alive from the dead. From the waters of baptism ye have come forth as citizens of heaven, to sojourn awhile on earth, that ye may show to all the purity and power of my gospel, being yourselves examples of all that is lovely and of good report in all the relations and conditions of life. It is yours to endure as seeing Him who is invisible; and to shed around you an influence that shall continually evince

* Matt. v. 11.

your heavenly birth. To you I have looked to be the first and foremost in promoting the interests of my kingdom. Where are ye, at this eventful period? Are ye duly mindful of what is implied in your baptism? Are ye truly and faithfully doing your utmost for that cause for which I became poor, and suffered *unto death, even the death of the cross?* Are ye dead to sin? Are ye living and laboring, not for yourselves, but for me;—for the riches and honors, not of earth, but of heaven? *Blessed is that servant whom his Lord, when he cometh, shall find so doing.** To you I have intrusted the vindicating of my wisdom and goodness in the institution of baptism, by exemplifying in your lives its holy tendency. Vain are all other vindications without this. My command will not be obeyed. Men will misunderstand and neglect baptism, and cling to their own substitutions and traditions. *Neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead.* Ye that have been baptized into my death must rise from the dead, in a better than the literal sense of the words. Wherever ye are, ye must stand forth, witnesses alive indeed from the dead, walking in

* Matt. xxiv. 46.

newness of life, and presenting, every day and every hour, a lovely, practical demonstration of the import and utility of baptism,— of the baptism which I have commanded. Ye must every one of you become a book of unanswerable arguments and eloquent expostulations, a living epistle from my own hand, known and read of all men. So will ye honor me and my command. So will baptism be restored to the place and the purposes for which I ordained it as the initiatory rite, marking the boundary between the world dead in sin, and the church alive to God, ascribing the spiritual life of the believer to my death, and, whenever it is administered, proclaiming to all, by an emblem more expressive than words, that *I am the way, and the truth, and the life.* *These things saith the first and the last, who was dead and is alive.— If ye love me, keep my commandments.*

O my brethren! it is indeed time to awake. Amidst all the prosperity of our churches, and all the spread of Christian truth, we have, certainly, much cause for gratitude and encouragement. But let us not be deceived into the opinion that a tenth, or a hundredth, or a thousandth part of what is attainable has already been at-

tained. Onward, our Saviour bids us Onward, at every remembrance of our baptism. The Holy Scriptures, by which only we should be content to estimate our attainments, bid us Onward. Our consciences this day condemn us, even the best of us, the most active and exemplary. Truly, we have but just begun to see and to feel what devolves upon us. The zeal and enterprise of others tell us it is no time for us to recline at our ease. The signal events of the times in which we live bid us, Up and be doing! From the forests of the West to these shores of the Atlantic, and from Halifax to New Orleans, the startling cry is heard, Awake, thou that sleepest! [New Orleans did I say? New Orleans is no longer an extreme point. The field demanding our labors has lately been so wonderfully enlarged as to strengthen, beyond the power of words to express, the force of the appeal. The cry is heard from the banks of the Columbia River, from the newly erected dwellings of San Francisco, from a long extent of coast on which are rolling the waves of the Pacific Ocean, and from many a mountain and many a valley, to which, though far remote from us, we may now have easy and rapid access, and for the religious character and

welfare of whose inhabitants there rests on us a responsibility limited only by the extent of our ability and our opportunities. The present is a great crisis in the history of our country, and of the world. Was there ever a time when disciples of Christ were more impressively called, than we are now, to exert a truly Christian influence, both in our own country, with all its dangers and all its precious hopes, and in foreign lands? To us who have voluntarily and so distinctly professed our discipleship, can the call be in vain? Shall it not be responded to with cheerfulness and promptitude?] * It is echoed from the mountains and valleys of Mexico and of South America,— Awake, thou that sleepest! Africa utters her groans, and beseeches us. Burmah,— all Asia implores us, by the whitening bones of the deluded pilgrims; by the unuttered anguish of the widows perishing on the funeral piles of their deceased husbands; in a word, by all the temporal woes of idolatry and superstition; and by the millions plunging, year after year, into the abyss of a dark eternity.† Eu-

* Inserted first in the edition of 1851.

† In December, 1829, the year after the delivery of this Discourse, *sutteeism*, or the self-immolation of the widow on the

rope, with all her refinement and elevation, urges us by all that is impressive in human condition and human prospects. The souls of thousands around us, of friends and kindred, of members of our own families, in danger of perishing, call us to holy circumspection and a life of prayer. The voice of our departing fathers and brethren charges us to live to God; to remember that our time is short; and to think constantly of the example and sufferings of Him who for us "humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."

If now, my brethren, we do sincerely desire to please our Lord and to benefit the souls of men, let the connection of the death and resurrection of Christ with our state and prospects, as represented in our baptism, be engraven on our hearts. Let it produce on our whole characters an abiding, sanctifying, powerful influence.

Let us especially, who are called to administer this ordinance, ourselves feel most deeply

funeral pile of her deceased husband, was abolished. — A signal encouragement to the Christian efforts of the humane! and a signal honor to Lord Bentinck, who was then Governor-General of the British dominions in India.

its practical import, and impress it most deeply on the minds of others ; and let us ever so live that none may imagine the baptism which we administer to be an indifferent, unmeaning, useless ceremony.

Let us all who are here assembled open our hearts — thou Spirit of truth and love ! do thou thyself open our hearts — to receive the impressions which this subject is adapted to make. Then shall we know *how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.* While we proceed to the duties before us, it will be delightful to think of those dear, departed men, whose presence used to shed a lovely influence on meetings like this, as now looking down from their lofty seats in heaven, or as hovering, like angels, over our assembly, and listening to our discussions, and rejoicing at the progress of these churches in which they felt so deep an interest while on earth. Yes, brethren, it will be delightful to think of them ; and, above all, to think of Him as being present, whose we are, and whom we serve, and into whose death we have been baptized.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

NOTE A. Page 5.

Proselyte Baptism.

THE learned controversies respecting Jewish proselyte baptism have been ably examined by the late Dr. E. G. Bengel, Professor and Superintendent of the Theological Seminary at Tubingen ; and it is probable that the middle course which he has adopted will commend itself, for the most part, to the approbation of the candid and intelligent. He says : ‘ Only we may suppose this as probable, that it [proselyte baptism] first came into use gradually, as it was customary to begin to increase the religious ceremonies prescribed in the Mosaic law by many traditional additions in the period after the return of the nation from the Babylonish exile ; that accordingly it may be considered so far a Pharisaical addition as the adding of new observances to what was prescribed in the written law belongs especially to the character of the Pharisees ; although *this* addition perhaps may have been introduced before a Pharisean sect had become so formed as to be opposed to other parties. It was reckoned in the same class with all those other lustrations to which they were accustomed. It was not regarded as a principal

thing, nor as an essentially necessary part of proselyte consecration. . . . But the entirely changed condition to which the Jews found themselves reduced by the overthrow of their state and of their temple,' (A. D. 70,) 'led at length, as it seems, to new and finally more fixed decrees and regulations on this subject.' See his Examination *Ueber das Alter der jüdischen Proselytentaufe*, p. 115.

In the same work, p. 63, he observes : 'John must have considered the question *Why baptizest thou?* as referring to *his* baptism, — to the essential and characteristic nature of it, already well known, on account of which the Jews believed that it could be committed only to the Messiah or to one of his prophetic heralds. It was perfectly obvious that they who came with the question had reference to *his* baptism, which was so peculiar, that there should belong to it an altogether special divine authority. It would have been quite superfluous for them to have made particular mention of *proselyte baptism*, which would not have been at all thought of, in connection with John's baptism.'

Another German author, Dr. Schneckenburger, has reëxamined the whole subject; and, in his elaborate work, (*Ueber das Alter der jüdischen Proselyten-Taufe und deren Zusammenhang mit dem johanneischen und christlichen Ritus,*) he has come, in his own way, to conclusions confirming those of Bengel on most points, and on some, to conclusions still more decidedly unfavorable to a derivation of John's and the Christian baptism from any proselyte baptism among the Jews. As the result of his investigations, he believes that the following general propositions may be held fast:—

1. The representation of the Talmud, by itself and

in comparison with other accounts, cannot prove that proselyte baptism was established before the time of Christ.

2. The passages from earlier writings, brought for the support of the Talmudical accounts, cannot afford any probable evidence, and, much less, any certainty.

3. The internal opposing evidence, furnished by the silence of the most considerable writers, or by particular facts which they have mentioned, retains its validity.

4. The difficulties in the way of admitting that this custom came to prevail among the Jews after it had arisen among the Christians, are not very great. Indeed, there are many reasons making it highly probable that, as an integral part of the initiatory ceremonies, it came up in this later time, as well as definite testimonies in favor of such an opinion.

5. We are not, therefore, to think of deriving John's and the Christian rite from this Jewish one ; and usages present themselves more akin to that rite, both in form and in signification, than the ablution of Jewish proselytes appears to have been.

Matthies, a still more recent German author, who has written a volume in Latin, entitled 'A Biblical, Historical, and Dogmatical Exposition of Baptism,' and has devoted a chapter to the consideration of the baptism of Jewish proselytes, is not fully prepared to accede to these propositions. But, though sometimes he seems to be too much influenced by the spirit of Wall, yet he mentions in terms of high respect the treatises of Bengel and Schneckenburger ; and, after criticizing some of their representations, he adds (p. 35) : 'Therefore, to make a distinct expression of our opinion, we think that, very long before John and Christ, to the Jewish proselyte

three things were necessary,—circumcision, ablution, and sacrifice ; then, that, after the destruction of the temple, the ablution was made more solemn, and that it was gradually amplified with several additions.'

De Wette, in his *Commentatio de Morte Jesu Christi Expiatoria* (p. 60), and in his *Lehrbuch der hebräisch-judischen Archäologie* (§ 246 a), maintains the opinions, substantially, which have been set forth by Bengel, with an approximation to those of Schneckenburger. In his Archæology, he makes the following brief statements, and sustains them by references too numerous to be here repeated : 'According to the Rabbis, circumcision, an offering, and baptism were necessary to the reception of proselytes. Baptism, however, is probably a later institute. For it is not mentioned in the older writings, but only in the Gemara, whose testimony speaks merely for the time after the destruction of Jerusalem, and in other later writings. Yet, connected with proselyte consecration there may have been in ancient times a kind of lustration, from which proselyte baptism (perhaps not without an imitation of the Christian) has arisen.'

Speaking of proselytes from heathenism to the Jewish nation, a Rabbi says : ' Every subject of baptism has need that he immerse his whole body ' *(כל הטובל)* *(צרים שיטבול כל נופו)*. And with this all accounts agree. Compare Bechai, fol. 87, col. 2. It is important to remember that no male Gentile who had not been circumcised was admitted to this ablution. For 'a male is not baptized till he is well healed of the wound occasioned by the circumcision which always precedes.' (*Masculus non baptizatur, nisi vulnusculo illo, quod e circumcione, quæ semper præcedit, ceperat, bene*

curato.) See *Danzii Baptism. Proselyt. in Meuschen Nov. Test. ex Talmude Antiq. Heb. Illustratum*, p. 283.

Hence it is evident that proselyte baptism was not immediately connected with circumcision. It intervened at a considerable distance between this and the presentation of an offering, and was more closely connected with the offering than with the circumcision; which, strictly speaking, must always have been the *initiatory* rite, whenever it could be performed. After the destruction of the temple, the offering could not lawfully be presented; and after the destruction of the temple, also, there were times in which the Jews were by imperial authority forbidden to perform the circumcision. In these circumstances, the ablution would naturally assume a greater importance than at any former period.

Whatever may have been the time when proselyte baptism, ablution, or lustration first came into use, the act was performed by the proselyte himself. John's baptism was administered by John to his disciples; and hence he was denominated the Baptist, that is, the Bap-tizer.

The ablution of proselytes among the Jews, whenever it was practised, must, so far as it was initiatory, have had reference mainly to ideas of national purity on the one hand, and to a want of it on the other. The rite performed by the harbinger of Christ was not a national, but a personal concern. It was administered to such Jews themselves as were penitent; and it had reference to the penitent individual's being cleansed from the pollution of his sins, in connection with the coming of the Messiah. Its import was readily comprehended in view of its resemblance to the innumerable daily

ablutions to which they had been accustomed ; — ablutions ten thousand times more frequent among them than any proselyte baptism.

NOTE B. Page 5.

Josephus's Account of the Essenes.

JOSEPHUS, in giving an account of the Essenes, presents the following, among other interesting particulars : — “ Before sunrising, they speak not a word about profane matters, but put up certain prayers, which they have received from their forefathers, as if they made a supplication for its rising. After this, every one of them is sent away by their curators to exercise some of those arts wherein they are skilled, in which they labor with great diligence till the fifth hour. After which they assemble themselves together again into one place, and when they have clothed themselves in white veils, they then bathe their bodies in cold water. And after this purification is over, they every one meet together in an apartment of their own, into which it is not permitted to any one of another sect to enter ; while they go, after a pure manner, into the dining-room, as into a certain holy temple, and quietly set themselves down. If any one hath a mind to come over to this sect, he is not immediately admitted, but he is prescribed the same method of living which they use, for a year, while he continues excluded, and they give him also a small hatchet, and the girdle, and the white garment. And when he hath given evidence, during that time, that he can observe their continence, he ap-

proaches nearer to their way of living, and is made a partaker of the waters of purification ; yet is he not even now admitted to live with them ; for after this demonstration of his fortitude, his temper is tried two more years, and if he appear to be worthy, they then admit him to their society.” Jewish War, B. ii. c. viii.

In regard to the words, *and is made a partaker of the waters of purification*, (or, as it stands in the original, καὶ καθαρωτέρων τῶν πρὸς ἀγνείαν ὑδάτων μεταλαμβάνει,) it may be well to bear in mind the statement of R. Abraham Sachut (in Juchasin, fol. 139, b.), whose description of the Essenes is taken chiefly from that of Josephus. “ After the lapse of a year, when they see that his conduct is good, they bring him in among them, and teach him to immerse himself, that they may accustom him to be a Pharisee, or one separated from others.”

NOTE C. Page 13.

Our being cleansed from Sin illustrated in Eph. v. 26.

Like the washing of water, by the word. τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ρήματι. In respect to the latter part of this clause, the form of the expression in the original, it will be perceived, corresponds exactly with the rendering of our English version, — *by the word*, — preposition answering to preposition, and noun to noun, and the whole indicating the instrument or means. That *the word* is the instrument will appear still more clearly by a comparison with the following passages : Rom. x. 8, the word of faith which we preach ; Acts xv. 9, purifying their hearts by faith ; Rom. x. 17, so then faith cometh

by hearing, and hearing by the word of God ; Eph. vi. 17, the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God ; 1 Pet. i. 25, this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you ; and John xvii. 17, sanctify them through thy truth : thy word is truth. That the former part of the clause, *τῷ λογισμῷ τοῦ ὄντος*, is intended to illustrate the cleansing performed *by the word*, and, as it were, present it by a figure to the eye, may be argued from the following, among other considerations.

The original here has no preposition answering to *with* in our common version. The noun that answers to *washing* is in that form or case (the dative) which in English is expressed most commonly by the preposition *to*, preceding the noun, — *to the washing*. Now what is expressed by the dative *form of the word* in Greek is, in Hebrew, (as it is in English,) expressed by a preposition ; — this Hebrew preposition, ל, meaning *to*, according to, after, or after the manner of, &c. In short, the sign of the dative case is often used as the sign of comparison and of manner. Thus, 1 Sam. xxv. 37, Nabal became לְאָבִן as a stone ; Micah ii. 8, my people is risen up לְאֹזֶן as an enemy ; literally, *to an enemy*, that is, *like to*, *after the manner of*, or *as*. Is. xi. 3. He shall not judge לְמַרְאָה עֲצֵית after the sight of his eyes ; literally, *to the sight*, that is, *according to*. A similar mode of expression is found in the New Testament also, the Greek of which, it is well known, is often conformed to the Hebrew idiom. In Acts xv. 1, the Judaizing teachers say, Except ye be circumcised τῷ ζθεὶ Μωϋσέως, *to*, that is, *according to*, or, as our translators express it, “*after the manner*” (the law) “*of Moses*, ye cannot be saved.” Could there be the shadow of a doubt respecting the force of the dative case in

this passage, it might be remarked that the modern Greek version exhibits the sense of the original by *κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τοῦ Μωϋσέως*; the Hebrew, in Hutter's Polyglot, by *כְּרָבְרַת מִשְׁהָ*; the German of Augusti and De Wette, by *nach dem Gesetz Moses*; and of Dr. Leander Van Ess, by *nach Moses Verordnung*; expressions, as every reader of these languages knows, equivalent to the English *according to the law of Moses*. Here the modern Greek version shows clearly that the dative case without a preposition may imply the same as the accusative with the preposition *κατά*; and one of the well-known senses of this preposition is, “in accordance with the mind, will, example, or *likeness* of.” Hence in the Septuagint it corresponds with *ל* (Is. xi. 3); and with *כ*, *as* or *like* (Lam. i. 12), to which, as Gesenius observes, *ל* is sometimes equivalent. In 1 Pet. iv. 2, the Apostle, speaking of the Christian convert as having ceased from sin, adds, that he no longer should live the rest of his time in the flesh *ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίᾳς*, *ἀλλὰ θελήματι θεοῦ*, *to* the lusts of men, but *to* the will of God; that is, that he should live, not *according to* the lusts of men, but *according to* the will of God. For other examples of a similar use of the dative, see Acts xxi. 21; Gal. vi. 16; and Philip. iii. 16. Indeed, in classic Greek, as well as in Hebraistic, the dative case is often used adverbially, or to express merely the *manner* according to which an action is performed by some person or thing. Thus a Greek author says of Alexander, that he made his enemies flee *δρόμῳ*, after the manner of, or like to, a race; and an eminent linguist explains this by the adverb *δρομάδην*. As another illustration of this use of the dative, Buttmann gives “*ταῦτα ἐγένετο τῷδε τῷ τρόπῳ*, this happened thus,” or according

to this manner. In English, also, we say of a man, he did a thing to perfection, that is, in a perfect manner ; he did it to purpose, that is, according to his purpose, or effectually ; he did it to admiration, that is, in an admirable manner.

With these facts in view, it seems very obvious that the phrase $\tauῷ λοιπῷ τοῦ ὕδατος$ means *according to, after the manner of, like to, or (to express it briefly) as or like* the washing of water.

NOTE D. Page 14.

John's and the Christian Baptism.

ON the topic here suggested it may be acceptable and useful to some of the readers of this sermon to see the representation given by the late Dr. Knapp, Professor of Theology in the University of Halle, and one of the brightest ornaments of the Lutheran Church in Germany. It occurs among his remarks on 1 John v. 6–11, in his *Scripta Varii Argumenti, maximam partem Exegetici et Historici*, and is as follows.

‘Nor are we to consider that baptism which Jesus [by his disciples and Apostles] administered as distinct in its own nature and whole kind from that of John. For such an opinion is opposed by the authority of Christ himself and his Apostles ; and if we regard these, we must confess that the baptism of each [of the harbinger and of the Messiah] was one and the same institute of God himself (John i. 33 ; Matt. xxi. 25 ; Acts i. 22) ; and that the design of each in administering it was one, inasmuch as it had the same looking to the *repent-*

ance of the candidates and their *faith in Christ*, whether about to come, or having come already. John i. 31; iii. 27—; Matt. xi. 12—; Mark i. 4; Luke iii. 3; x. 24; Acts xix. 4. . . . After John had known Jesus to be the Messiah, he sent his own disciples expressly to him *who had come*, as the one who was the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world (John i. 29—36; Acts xix. 4); but he did not himself cease to baptize (John iii. 23; iv. 1); yet Jesus, while John was alive and at liberty, commanded to baptize by his own authority and in his own name (John iii. 22—26; iv. 1, 2). John coöperated harmoniously; and each, in the most friendly manner, bore testimony to the character of the other. (John iii. 27—36; Matt. xxi. 25; xi. 1; xvii. 11—). . . . Hence among the Apostles and others who had already been baptized by John (Acts xviii. 25), no one, so far as we have any account, who professed his faith to have been placed in *Jesus* as the Messiah, was baptized anew. In the beginning of the Christian church, consisting as it did of those who had been baptized by John, they only were considered in the number of the unbaptized or wrongly baptized, who, not having faith in Christ *Jesus* come in the flesh, were looking for *another* Christ yet to come (compare Luke vii. 19, 20); some of whom [may have been among those that] had openly rejected Jesus (Acts ii. 38, 41; compare ver. 23 and 36); and others had been ignorant and uninstructed respecting the institutes and work of *Jesus* (Acts xix. 1—). All these, as well as those who had never received baptism, were, if received into the society of Christians, baptized *in the name of the Lord JESUS* (Acts xix. 5; compare ii. 38; viii. 16). For they had been deficient in regard to that important in-

junction of John, *that they should believe on him who should come after him*, and had supposed themselves, by their baptism, obligated to John, and not to *Jesus*, whom nevertheless he himself had come to announce. Compare John i. 31 – 34.'

Such is the language of a venerable Lutheran, of the present age. And Calvin himself says, "The divers hands wherewith it is ministered make not the baptisme divers: but the same doctrine sheweth it to be the same baptisme. *John* and the Apostles agreed into one doctrine: both baptized into repentance, both into the forgivenesse of sinnes, both into the name of Christ, from whom was both repentance and forgivenesse of sinnes. *John* said that hee was the Lambe of God, by whom the sinnes of the world should bee taken away: where hee made him the sacrifice acceptable to the Father, the Propitiator of righteousnesse, the author of salvation. What could the Apostles adde to this confession? Wherefore let it trouble no man, that the old writers labour to sever the one from the other, whose voice wee ought not so much to esteeme that it may shake the certaintie of the Scripture. For who will rather harken to Chrysostome denying that forgivenesse of sinnes was comprehended in the baptisme of John, than to Luke contrariwise affirming that John preached the baptisme of repentance into the forgivenesse of sinne? Neither is that subtlety of Augustine to bee received, that in the baptisme of John, sinnes were forgiven in hope, but in the baptisme of Christ they are forgiven indeed. For whereas the Evangelist plainly testifieth, that John in his baptisme promised the forgivenesse of sinnes: what need wee to abate this title of commendation, when no necessitie compelleth us un-

to it? But if any man seek for a difference out of the Word of God, he shall finde none other but this, that John baptized into him that was to come, the Apostles into him that had already presented himself." *Institutes*, B. iv. c. 15, sect. 7. (Norton's translation. London, 1634.)

In connection with what is here said, we are to remember the adaptation, mentioned in the Discourse as having been first introduced by our Lord, when he gave his great commission, Matt. xxviii. 18–20. 'The identity of John's baptism with that which was administered by Christ, or rather by his disciples while he was with them, and which likewise was only a speaking symbol in the service of the preaching,' it is remarked by Schneckenburger (p. 53), 'must surely be conceded.' The decree of the Papal Church in the Council of Trent (seventh session) is painfully interesting: 'If any one say that the baptism of John had the same efficacy with the baptism of Christ, let him be accursed!' (Si quis dixerit, baptismum Johannis habuisse eandem vim cum baptismo Christi, anathema sit!)

NOTE E. Page 20.

Baptism the Answer of a Good Conscience.

ON this verse it is gratifying to be able to transcribe the following article from Wahl's Lexicon of the New Testament, translated by Dr. Robinson, and printed at Andover, 1825.

"Ἐπερώτημα, (pp. *interrogation*, Thuc. iii. 53, 54,) in N. T. *promise*, *engagement*, *profession*. 1 Pet. iii. 21. βάπτισμα — συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεὸν δι'

ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, *baptism* in which is implied the profession of a conscience tranquil towards God through (or on account of) the resurrection of Christ; spoken probably in reference to the practice of the ancient church, in which the person about to receive baptism was interrogated in respect to his belief, &c., something in this manner: ‘Do you renounce all your former vicious dispositions and conduct, and devote yourself to the service of God through Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us?’ See Justin Mart. Apol. II. 61 with Acts viii. 37.”

NOTE F. Page 23.

How we are buried with Christ.

Buried with him by baptism. — “The language is figurative.” The word *συνεπάφημεν* means “we were interred or covered up in a grave, or laid in a tomb,” or buried with Christ. How? *By baptism*, the Apostle adds; and this addition modifies the figure, and makes the sense as clear as it is possible for express words to make it. *In or by baptism*, then, Paul and the Christians whom he addressed were *buried*. To be crucified to the world, or dead to sin, is the character of the Christian; but to be buried with Christ by baptism, is the appointed emblematical *profession* of that character. The Apostle does not teach that believers are *crucified* with Christ, or are *dead* with Christ, or possess a *mortified* temper, *by baptism*. To have such a state of soul, to be dead in respect to sin, is one thing; and to be buried with Christ *by baptism*, is quite a different thing; for this is external, whereas the other is internal.

The one is a sign ; the other, the thing signified. It is only by confounding what the Apostle has kept distinct, that there can be any mistake concerning this passage. Let the honest inquirer after truth and duty listen to the dictate of common sense ; and let the religious teacher, as he expects to appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, beware how he perverts the oracles of God, and darkens counsel by words without knowledge.

Jaspis, in a note on this part of his recent Latin version of the Epistles, acknowledges the truth, though he afterwards makes a feeble attempt to escape from the legitimate consequence. He says : ‘ Paul in this place alludes to the custom, then usual, of immersing the whole body, which immersion resembled the laying of a man in a sepulchre.’ (Paulus hoc loco ad morem tunc usitatum respicit, totum corpus immergendi, quæ immersio habebat speciem hominis in sepulchro reconditi.) p. 33.

The remarks of Rosenmüller on the same passage are worthy of serious consideration. ‘ Immersion in the water of baptism and coming forth out of it, was a symbol of a person’s renouncing his former life, and on the contrary beginning a new one. The learned have rightly reminded us, that, on account of this emblematical meaning of baptism, the rite of *immersion* ought to have been retained in the Christian Church.’ (*Immersio* in aqua baptismi, ex eademque egressus erat symbolum vitæ pristinæ abrogandæ, novæque contra instituendæ. Recte monent docti, propter hunc baptismi sensum mysticum, *immersionis* ritum retineri debuisse in ecclesia Christiana.) See his *Scholia in Novum Testamentum*, Vol. III. p. 454.

Such, too, was the conviction of Luther, in view of this passage, who, after speaking of baptism as a sym-

bol of death and resurrection, says : ‘ On this account I could wish that such as are to be baptized should be completely immersed into water, according to the meaning of the word, and the signification of the ordinance, not because I think it necessary, but because it would be beautiful to have a full and perfect sign of so perfect and full a thing ; *as also without doubt it was instituted by Christ.*’ (Hac ratione motus, vellem baptizandos penitus in aquam immergi, sicut sonat vocabulum et signat mysterium, non quod necessarium arbitrer, sed quod pulchrum foret, rei tam perfectæ et plenæ, signum quoque plenum et perfectum dari, sicut et institutum est sine dubio a Christo.) See his work entitled *Captivitas Babylonica*, in the collection *Omni. Oper. M. Lutheri*, Vol. II. p. 76, ed. 1551.

Considering what the practice has been, the doctrine of the Lutheran Church, (as well as of the Church of England,) on this subject, has been remarkable. In expounding it, one of her distinguished theologians of the present day states: *To the existence of baptism belongs, 1. complete immersion under water, &c.* (Zum Wesen der Taufe gehört nämlich 1, das ganzliche Untertauchen unter das Wasser, u. s. w.) See Bretschneiders’s *Dogmatik der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche*, Vol. II. p. 657.

Another Lutheran theologian, the author of a volume which has already been mentioned, the Biblical, Historical, and Dogmatical Exposition of Baptism, a work which obtained a prize at the University of Berlin, says (p. 116) : ‘ Paul, as [in speaking of Rom. vi. 3, &c.] we have seen, has in his mind only the rite of immersing and emerging ; and in the Apostolical Church, in order that a communion with the death of Christ

might be signified, the whole body of the person to be baptized was immersed in the water or river, and then, in order that a connection with the resurrection of Christ might be indicated, the body again emerged, or was raised out of the water. *That this rite has been changed is indeed to be lamented ; for it placed before the eyes, most aptly, the symbolical meaning of baptism.* (Paulus, ut vidimus, solummodo immergendi et emergendi ritum in animo habet ; neque minus in Ecclesia Apostolica, ut mortis Christi communio significaretur, totum baptizandi corpus aquæ vel flumini immergebatur, et deinde, ut resurrectionis Christi societas inueretur, corpus iterum emergebat, seu extrahebatur ex aqua. *Dolendum quidem est, hunc ritum, quippe qui aptissime symbolicam baptismi significationem ante oculos ponat, esse mutatum.*) But he immediately adds : ‘ Nevertheless, the same changed rite, although less perfect than it was, by no means changes the nature of baptism or its object. As Christ in instituting baptism makes no mention of the necessity of immersing, so Paul, in explaining the symbolical meaning of baptism, does not so much show the necessity of immersing as merely explain what the symbolical rite of baptism indicates ! (Attamen idem mutatus ritus, quamquam minus priore est perfectus, nequaquam baptismi naturam seu id, quo baptismi sententia tendit, immutat. Ut Christus in instituendo baptisme nullam immergendi necessitatis facit mentionem, sic etiam Paulus in explicanda symbolica baptismi significatione, non tam immergendi necessitatem ostendit, quam simpliciter explanat, quid symbolicus baptizandi ritus sibi velit.)

In reply, I trust that it will be sufficient to ask, Who has received authority to change an observance which

the glorious Head of the Church himself instituted? When the blessed Lord and Saviour who died for us, and who knew perfectly what would be best for his people and for all beholders, commands us to do an act, must he make mention of the *necessity* of our doing that act rather than some other? When the newly converted Paul cried, *Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?* was he either disposed or at liberty to go to some other city, because the Lord made no mention of the necessity of his going to Damascus? And when he arrived at Damascus, was he either disposed or at liberty to substitute, in professing his faith in Christ, some other figurative act instead of that which he knew to be meant when Ananias said, ‘And now, why tarriest thou? Arise, and be *baptized*?’

Clinical Baptism and Sprinkling.

In further apologizing for the change, the author refers to 1 Pet. i. 2, and Heb. xii. 24, where ‘the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ’ and ‘the blood of sprinkling’ are mentioned; — passages that have no connection with baptism; and to the substitution of sprinkling for immersion, in the case of persons too sick to be immersed. This, which is commonly mentioned as the baptism of clinics, he seems to regard as an authoritative change. ‘But if,’ he says, ‘by the rite of sprinkling the true nature of baptism would be changed, surely in the apostolic age and later time such baptism (that of clinics or persons confined by sickness to their beds) would not have been admitted.’ (Quodsi adspergendi ritu vera baptissi natura mutaretur, ætate apostolica et posteriori tempore ejusmodi baptisma (baptisma clinicorum) profecto non esset admissum.) We

have no evidence that it was admitted ‘*in the apostolic age*.’ It first occurs at a much later period, when innovations in religious rites were frequent, when a saving efficacy was too generally attributed to an external act, and when a formal initiation into the Church was too generally regarded as absolutely necessary to salvation. The case of Novatian, at Rome, in the first half of the third century, as presented in the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius (B. VI. c. 43), is, probably, the earliest on record. Concerning Novatian, (for this name is often merely a prolonged form of the name Novatus,) the historian gives the following extract from an epistle of Cornelius, bishop of Rome, to Fabius, bishop of Antioch : ‘ Relieved by the exorcists, he fell into an obstinate disease, and being supposed about to die, he, having been *sprinkled*, [or more literally, *poured around*, *perfused*, περιχυθείσ], on the bed itself where he lay, received [the divine grace]; if indeed it must be that such a man received it.’ (‘Ος βοηθούμενος ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπορκιστῶν, νόσῳ περιπεσὼν χαλεπῇ, καὶ ἀποθανεῖσθαι ὅσον οὐδέ πω νομιζόμενος, ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ κλίνῃ ἦ ἔκειτο, περιχυθείσ ἔλαβεν· εἴ γε χρὴ λέγειν τὸν τοιοῦτον εἰληφέναι.)

Here Valesius, well known as a most learned editor of Eusebius, remarks that ‘ Rufinus rightly translates the Greek word (περιχυθείσ) *perfused*. For clinics, when they could not be immersed by the priest, were only perfused with water. Therefore such baptism was held to be wanting in solemnity, and imperfect, because it seemed to be received, not voluntarily, but through fear of death, by persons delirious and destitute of perception. Moreover, since baptism properly signifies immersion, such perfusion could hardly be called baptism.’ (Accedit quod, cum baptismus proprie mer-

sionem significet, ejusmodi perfusio vix baptismus dici poterat.)

Most of the translators of Eusebius, however, Latin and English, have made him speak of Novatian as having received *baptism by aspersion*. But the word *baptism*, it will be perceived, does not occur in the original. That what was here contemplated by the writer as the thing received or not, was divine grace or forgiveness of sins, is sufficiently evident from a passage in the Apostolical Constitutions, B. VI. c. 15, where a faultiness of a different kind is brought to view, and those who are baptized by heretics are said to be not initiated but polluted, ‘not receiving the remission of sins’ (*οὐκ ἀφεστιν ἀμαρτιῶν λαμβάνοντες*). It is evident, also, from Chrysostom’s first address to the Catechumens, where, after mentioning *the gifts of grace* (*τὰ τῆς χάριτος*) as being conferred equally on Christians, whenever initiated, he proceeds to speak elliptically of these as *receiving*, in different circumstances; and from an epistle of Cyprian to Magnus (Ep. 76), where Cyprian has supplied what is understood in the extract inserted by Eusebius:—‘You have inquired also, dearest son, what I think concerning those who in feebleness and languor obtain the grace of God, whether they are to be considered legitimate Christians, since with the saving water they have not been bathed, but perfused.’ (Quæsisti etiam fili charissime, quid mihi de illis videatur, qui in infirmitate et languore gratiam Dei consequuntur, an habendi sint legitimi Christiani, eo quod aqua salutari non loti sint, sed perfusi.)

Such a substitution must have been comparatively new in the time of Cyprian, about the middle of the third century. Had it been a well-established usage,

there would have been no need of asking his opinion as to its validity. And had it been a well-established usage, would he have begun and ended his reply as he does? He begins by saying: ‘In regard to this, my humble judgment does not deprive any one of his prerogative, so as to hinder him from deciding and acting according to his own convictions.’ (*Qua in parte, nemini verecundia et modestia nostra præjudicat, quò minus unusquisque quod putat, sentiat, et quod senserit, faciat.*) Here he means to assert, that, in this matter, he would not venture to prescribe an opinion for any bishop. That this is his meaning is evident from the close of the epistle, where the term (*præpositus*) is expressed, and where, with much apparent self-diffidence, the disavowal is very emphatically repeated. (. . . *nemini præscribentes, quominus statuat quod putat unusquisque præpositus.*) So modestly, sometimes, have important changes begun to be established!

Cyprian identified or confounded admission into the Church with the receiving of divine grace, so as to be forgiven and saved. Christ, he supposed, had sanctified water, and made it an instrument of salvation in the Church. Out of the Church, in his view, there was no salvation. The divine grace, he thought, was bestowed on true believers in connection with the external priestly act initiating by water or admitting them into the Church. Under these impressions, he maintains that the gracious act of God conferring salvation, when the correctly believing priest applies the instrument, is not diminished in the case proposed. ‘For,’ he remarks, ‘in the sacrament of salvation, sins are not washed away, as the filth of the skin and of the body in a carnal and secular bath. . . . It is otherwise

that the breast of the believer is made clean ; it is otherwise that the mind of man is purified by virtue of faith.' (Neque enim sic in sacramento salutari delictorum contagia, ut in lavacro carnali et sæculari sordes cutis et corporis abluntur. Aliter pectus credentis abluitur ; aliter mens hominis per fidei merita mundatur.)

But, in the name of candor and Christian sobriety, let it be asked, Why confound the appointed sign with the thing signified ? Why identify the saving change with the act of initiation into the Church ?

Cyprian proceeds : ' In the saving sacraments, when necessity compels, and God grants his indulgence, divine compendiums confer on believers the whole.' (In sacramentis salutaribus, necessitate cogente, et Deo indulgentiam suam largiente, totum creditibus conferunt divina compendia.) But *when necessity compels*, surely, the compassionate Saviour permits the dying believer, as he did his own penitent companion on the cross, to omit baptism.

In the next place, he argues from Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 26, ' Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean : from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you ' ; from Num. xix., quoted by him thus : ' And the man who shall be impure until the evening, shall be purified on the third day and the seventh, and shall be pure. But if he shall not be purified on the third day and the seventh, he shall not be pure ; and that soul shall be exterminated from Israel, because the water of sprinkling has not been sprinkled upon him ' ; (Et homo qui fuerit immundus usque ad vesperam, hic purificabitur

die tertio et die septimo, et mundus erit. Si autem non fuerit purificatus die tertio et die septimo, non erit mundus; et exterminabitur anima illa de Israel, quoniam aqua aspersionis non est super eum sparsa); and from Num. viii. 6, 7: ‘Take the Levites from among the children of Israel, and cleanse them. And thus shalt thou do unto them, to cleanse them: sprinkle water of purifying upon them.’

To perceive the irrelevancy of all these passages, the intelligent Christian reader, at the present day, has only to examine them in their respective connections, and seriously ask himself, Do they refer to the figurative act in which my Lord and Saviour would have his disciples baptized into his death?

This array of citations is concluded by the following: ‘And again, The water of sprinkling is purification.’ (Et iterum: Aqua aspersionis purificatio est.) ‘Whence,’ he adds, ‘it appears that aspersion also of water, like the saving bath, obtains; and that, when these things are done in the Church, where the faith of the administrator and of the candidate is sound, all stand firm and can be consummated and perfected by the majesty of the Lord and the verity of the faith.’ (Unde apparent aspersionem quoque aquæ instar salutaris lavacri obtinere; et quando hæc in Ecclesia fiunt, ubi sit et dantis et accipientis fides integra, stare omnia et consummari ac perfici posse majestate Domini et fidei veritate.) — ‘And therefore, so far as by faith it is given to me to conceive and think, my sentence is this: That whoever may have obtained divine grace in the Church by the law and right of faith, may be considered a legitimate Christian.’ (Et idcirco quantum fide concipere et sentire nobis datur, mea sententia hæc est, ut Chris-

tianus judicetur legitimus, quisquis fuerit in Ecclesia lege et jure fidei divinam gratiam consecutus.)

Such, in brief, is the plea of Cyprian for sprinkling, in case of necessity, on the bed of sickness and death.

The sanction of this powerful bishop and illustrious martyr could not fail of giving currency to such views, on the subject, as he has presented. The renowned Augustine, too, in the last years of the fourth century and the early part of the fifth, adopting the same views, contributed much to their prevalence, from age to age, especially in the western portion of Christendom. See his Tract. LXXX. on John.

Many, however, called in question the validity of aspersion; and to commend it, and silence all objections, Gregory, patriarch of Rome (from A. D. 590 to 604), adduces the miraculous bedewing of St. Apollonius. ‘When,’ he says, ‘it was objected as a reproach to St. Apollonius that he had not been *bathed* in baptism, and therefore was not a Christian, God kindly heard his cry in repelling the accusation, and satisfied the prayers poured forth by him; for he sent down a cloud, and perfused the head of the saint in the dew.—If, therefore, baptism is not performed by perfusion of the head, this would not have been done.’ (S. Apollonio, cum objectum illi esset a tyranno ut probrum, quod baptismo non ablatus, proinde non esset Christianus; fusis ab eo precibus satisfecit Deus, depreciationem ejus benigne audiens; demissa enim nube, caput ejus rore perfudit.—Si igitur baptismus non perficitur perfusione capitis, non ita sed alio modo res gesta esset.) See *Apolog. adv. Marci Epist.*; and compare Dr. Brenner’s *Geschichtliche Darstellung der Verrichtung der Taufe von Christus bis auf unsere Zeiten*, p. 16.

It would be a great misapprehension to think that all clinics initiated into the Church, were initiated by sprinkling or pouring. *This*, Dr. Brenner, after speaking of its occurrence in Italy and France before the close of the sixth century, states, without hesitation, *was applied only in case of necessity* (nur im Nothfalle); and he adds, ‘When, for example, there was no suitable place for immersion, or the candidate was seized with a severe sickness, making immersion impossible; although otherwise *even clinics were immersed.*’ (Wenn z. B. kein zum Untertauchen schichtliche Ort vorhanden, oder der Taüfling von einer sehr schweren, das Untertauchen unmöglich machenden, Krankheit befallen ist; obgleich sonst *auch Bettlägerige Kranke untergetaucht werden.*)

The statement here given from this learned Roman Catholic historian may be found in his *Darstellung*, or *History of the Administration of Baptism*, p. 15.

It was not easy to convince men that sprinkling expressed all that was designed to be expressed by immersion. This was especially difficult in the Eastern Church, and where the Greek language was more familiarly used than it was for the most part in the Western, the portion of the empire closely connected with Rome.

Nicephorus, the Greek ecclesiastical historian, seems to speak disparagingly, in an ironical manner, of the act initiating Novatian. He uses in relation to it a qualifying word ($\delta\hat{\eta}\theta\epsilon\nu$), which, according to the best Greek authorities, is employed *preëminently in an ironical sense*, very much as we use the word *forsooth*:—‘So that he,’ (such is the account,) ‘so that he, in the apprehension of approaching death, requested to re-

ceive the water ; which, even in the bed itself where he lay, being poured or sprinkled, forsooth, baptized him,' i. e. immersed him, or accomplished an immersion. (— ὥστ' ἀποθανεῖσθαι προσδόκιμον ὅντα, τὸ ὑδωρ αἰτήσαι λαβεῖν· ὁ καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ κλίνῃ ἡ ἔκειτο περιχυθὲν δῆθεν ἐβάπτιζεν.)

The so-called Apostolical Constitutions, whatever may be thought of their origin, are admitted by all to exhibit a pretty correct image of the Church as it was in the latter part of the third century, and in the fourth. They were written in Greek, and most probably in the East ; and they know nothing of any substitution for immersion. That, in those times, this was the initiating act, is evident from B. III. c. 16 and 17. In the 17th chapter, explaining what is the meaning of Baptism into Christ, it is said, 'The water is instead of (i. e. represents) the burial ; the descent into the water, the dying together with Christ ; the ascent out of the water, the rising again with him.' (Τὸ δὲ ὑδωρ ἀντὶ ταφῆς· ἡ κατάδυσις τὸ συναποθανεῖν, ἡ ἀνάδυσις τὸ συναναστῆναι.)

The celebrated 12th canon of the Council of Neo-Cæsarea, A. D. 315, prohibiting from offices in the Church, except in certain cases, those who had been initiated into it in sickness, uses no expression that recognizes or implies any substitution for immersion. It employs the figurative term that was often employed to indicate the supposed illumination of the true and complete Christian : ' If any one being sick be *enlightened*, &c. (Ἐὰν νοσῶν τις φωτισθῇ, κ. τ. λ.) See Mansi's *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, Tom. II. p. 542.

Chrysostom, near the close of the fourth century, in

one of his Homilies to the Catechumens, paints, in vivid colors, the scene which may be exhibited in the sick-chamber of one who defers baptism till he is about to die. He says nothing, however, of affusion, though it may, perhaps, be inferred from his speaking of some as receiving divine grace in the bed. But he makes the following remarkable and suggestive inquiry : ‘ When he who is immediately to be illuminated neither knows the persons present, nor hears their voice, nor is able to respond to those words with which he makes the sacred covenant with the Lord of us all, but is as a piece of idle wood or a stone, and differs in nothing from a dead man ; *in such a want of perception, what is the benefit of being initiated ?* ’ (. . . . τί τῆς μνησταγωγίας ὄφελος ἐν ἀναισθησίᾳ τοσαύτῃ;) See Tom. II. pt. 1, p. 267, of his Entire Works, Paris ed. 1838.

Socrates Scholasticus, who, early in the fifth century, wrote a continuation of Eusebius’s Ecclesiastical History, has recorded with some particularity an instructive case of clinical baptism. The account is given in B. VII. c. 4. A Jew had for many years been confined to his bed with a palsy. Atticus, who was bishop of Constantinople from A. D. 406 to 427, instructed him in the principles of the Christian religion, and had him brought in his bed to the place where the light of initiation was imparted (*κομισθῆναι σὺν τῇ κλίνῃ κελεύει ἐπὶ τῷ φωτιστήριον*), and where, manifestly, he was immersed ; for express mention is made of his being raised out of the pool of the baptistery (*ἀπὸ τῆς κολυμβήθρας τοῦ Βαπτιστηρίου ἀναληφθείς*).

Dr. Brenner’s historical work on Baptism I have already had occasion to mention, as the production of a

highly intelligent Roman Catholic. It may not be useless to translate from that work, p. 306, the first paragraph of what he gives as a

SYNOPTICAL VIEW OF ANCIENT TIMES AND OF MODERN,
IN RESPECT TO BAPTISM,

[AMONG THOSE WHO ACKNOWLEDGE THE PAPAL AUTHORITY].

Formerly.

Thirteen hundred years, Baptism was generally and ordinarily an immersion of the person under water, and only in extraordinary cases a sprinkling or pouring with water; the latter, as a mode of baptism, was, moreover, called in question, aye, even forbidden.

At present.

Now Baptism is generally and ordinarily a pouring of the person with water; and only in the Church of Milan immersion still continues, as something peculiar to this Church alone, and extraordinary; elsewhere it would be punishable.

Almost simultaneously with the publication of Brenner's work, in the first quarter of the present century, a member of the Greek Church, De Stourdza, published in French a volume, entitled, Considerations on the Doctrine and the Spirit of the Greek Church (*Considérations sur la Doctrine et l'Esprit de l'Église Orthodoxe*); in which, p. 87, he says:—

‘The distinctive character of the institution of baptism is immersion, *βάπτισμα*, which cannot be omitted without destroying the emblematical meaning of the sacrament, and without contradicting, at the same time, the etymological signification of the word which serves to designate it.

‘The Western [or Papal] Church, then, has departed

from the imitation of Jesus Christ. She has made to disappear all the sublimity of the external sign. In short, she commits an abuse of words and of ideas in practising *baptism by aspersion*, of which the mere announcement is already a contradiction liable to derision. In effect, the verb *βαπτίζω* — immergo — has only one acceptation. It, literally and perpetually, signifies to *plunge*. Baptism and immersion, therefore, are identical; and to say *baptism by aspersion* is as if one should say *immersion by aspersion*, or utter any other contradiction of the same nature.'

(Le caractère distinctif de l'institution du baptême est donc *l'immersion*, *βάπτισμα*, qu'on ne saurait omettre, sans détruire le sens mystérieux du sacrement, et sans contredire eu même tems la signification étymologique du mot qui sert le désigner.

L'église d'Occident s'est donc écarté de l'imitation de Jésus Christ; elle a fait disparaître toute la sublimité du signe extérieur; enfin elle commet un abus de mots et d'idées, en pratiquant le *baptême par aspersion* dont le seul énoncé est déjà une contradiction dérisoire. En effet le verbe *βαπτίζω* — immergo — n'a qu'une seule acceptation. Il signifie littéralement et perpetuellement *plonger*. Baptême et immersion sont donc identiques; et dire *baptême par aspersion*, c'est comme si l'on disait *immersion par aspersion*, ou tout autre contresens de la même nature.)

A correct view of the design of baptism shows that immersion is required. That view presents itself readily to the childlike and unprejudiced reader of the New Testament. Besides, it is confirmed by the best Greek scholarship, and by the voice of ancient ecclesiastical history.

Some of the adventurous attempts which have recently been made to call in question the meaning of the word *baptism*, must, sooner or later, be contemplated with grief and astonishment. This, probably, will be the lot of the brilliant and plausible work by the Rev. Professor Wilson, of the Royal College at Belfast, Ireland ; a work which endeavors to prove *Infant Baptism a Scriptural Service, and Dipping unnecessary to its right Administration*. It professes to contain “a critical survey and digest of the leading evidence, classical, biblical, and patristic ; with special reference to the work of Dr. Carson.” But it awakens a lively recollection of Archbishop Whately’s ingenious pamphlet setting forth *Historic Doubts relative to the Existence and Achievements of Napoleon Bonaparte*.

Alas ! why should redeemed and grateful disciples of Christ disregard or change an observance instituted by Him ? Why should any of his well-informed ministers *teach men so ?*

This is not the place for an extended discussion ; and I must terminate my remarks. The question to be decided by the honest and unsophisticated inquirer is, not whether the word *baptize*, or some kindred expression, may not, in some connection, have been used by some writer in an improper or figurative way, so as not to imply, strictly, an immersion ; but, What was the act which we have reason to believe that our Lord had in mind, when he instituted baptism ? Surely, his will, duly ascertained, must be our guide.

THE

MEANING OF IRENÆUS IN THE PHRASE
“REGENERATED UNTO GOD”;

By IRAH CHASE, D. D.

FIRST PUBLISHED IN

THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA AND THEOLOGICAL REVIEW,
FOR NOVEMBER, 1849.

THE

MEANING OF IRENÆUS IN THE PHRASE “REGENERATED UNTO GOD.”

SEVERAL years ago, my attention was called to the passage embracing the memorable phrase *renascuntur in Deum*, in the work of Irenæus against heresies ; and the following article presents the result of an examination, instituted for the purpose of ascertaining the sense in which he there uses that phrase. I was not satisfied with any explanation of it which I had seen ; and I resolved to let the author himself furnish an explanation. I examined every page of his work, and was led to a conclusion which, to me, was quite unexpected. I reexamined the whole, and was again conducted to the same conclusion.

Since that time, I have, here and there, met with some brief statements indicating that others have been led to a similar result ; as in the History of Doctrines by Baumgarten-Crusius (Vol. II. p. 1209), and in Dr. Krabbe's Prize Essay on the Apostolical Constitutions (p. 410). Böhringer, in his recent historical work, entitled The Church of Christ and its Witnesses (Vol. I. pp. 245 – 254), assumes substantially the same exposition. What was published on the subject in one of our

periodicals, in 1838, was, in effect, primarily derived from the examination which I have mentioned, and was confirmed by an independent examination.

Most of those who have written with commendable erudition respecting Irenæus, have been occupied with discussions which have led them away from examining the particular point which I have endeavored to elucidate. That the impartial and venerable Neander should seem to have acquiesced in an interpretation which I suppose to be erroneous, may easily have arisen from the intensity with which, while he was reading Irenæus, his mind was attracted to other matters than the one here discussed. Were he to read him with a special view to this, he would, I am confident, come to the result set forth in the subsequent pages.

Respecting the manner in which the subject is presented by the learned Mr. Wall, and by the equally learned Schlosser, who translated Mr. Wall's History from English into Latin, and enlarged it with Observations and Defences, more than a hundred years ago, it is unnecessary, I trust, to make any remark. Let every candid and earnest inquirer after truth read, and judge for himself.

Views resembling those of Irenæus on the relation of Christ to mankind, whether right or wrong, are scattered over the fields of theological literature, ancient and modern. To understand his expressions correctly is desirable, as being connected with the history of opinions, and with an argument from ecclesiastical antiquity. For no thoroughly Christian teacher would think it right and wise, even in maintaining the truth, to employ a wrong exposition of a passage, occurring either in the Holy Scriptures or in the writings of the Fathers.

I. According to Irenæus, Christ, in becoming incarnate and thus assuming his mediatorial work, brought the human family into a new relation, under himself, and placed them in a condition in which they can be saved. In this sense, he is the Saviour of all. He restored them, or summed them up anew, in himself. He became, so to speak, a second Adam, the regenerator of mankind. Through him they are regenerated unto God : *per eum renascuntur in Deum.*

The thought occurs frequently ; and it is variously modified by the various connections in which it is introduced.

In the passage which has often been brought forward as recognizing the baptism of infants, Irenæus is maintaining that Christ appeared as he really was, and passed through the various stages of human life, sanctifying, it is added, sanctifying every age by the likeness that it had to himself ; *for he came to save all by himself ; — all, I say, since by him they are regenerated unto God,* — infants, and little ones, and children,*

* *Omnis enim venit per semetipsum salvare : omnes, inquam, — qui per eum renascuntur in Deum, etc.* That *omnes* is repeated for the purpose of giving it, not restriction, but emphasis, is manifest from the amplification which is extended throughout the paragraph. The proposition that Christ came to save all by himself seems to be based on the assumed fact that by him all are regenerated unto God. That, whatever is meant here by being regenerated, it was, in such a connection as this, conceived of as belonging to all, appears also from other passages, in which the same thing or its equivalent is most clearly attributed to ‘all,’ to ‘man,’ or to ‘men,’ without any limitation ; in short, to mankind, the whole human family, ‘*genus humanum.*’ The critical reader will perceive that, in accordance with this view, *qui*, in the connection above, is regarded as being used instead of a conjunction with a demonstrative pronoun, and as capable of being freely translated *since they*, or simply *and they*. The relative *qui*, it is

and youths, and elder persons. Therefore he came through the several ages, and for infants was made an infant, sanctifying infants; among little ones, a little one, sanctifying those of that age, and at the same time being to them an example of piety, uprightness, and obedience; among the youth, a youth, becoming an example to the youths, and sanctifying them to the Lord; thus also an elderly person among elderly persons, that he might be a perfect master among all, not only in respect to the presentation of truth, but also in respect to age, sanctifying at the same time also the elderly persons, and becoming to them an example. Then, too, he passed through even unto death, that he might be the first-born from the dead, himself holding the primacy in all things, the Prince of life, superior to all, and preceding all. B. II. c. 22, § 4.*

What Irenæus thought of baptism must be gathered from the passages in which he is speaking of the subject. But that he is speaking of it in this passage there is no sufficient evidence. For a mere resemblance in

well known, is sometimes used in this manner. See Cicero's Letters to Atticus, Lib. V. Epist. 20: Ephesum ut venirem, etc. I attach no special importance to my version. But I prefer it to the usual and literal one, as presenting the purport of the Latin phraseology more readily to the English reader. The Greek original of this passage being lost, we cannot speak positively of its form. But there seems to be no good reason to doubt that it has been rendered into Latin with much literalness. And we know that in Greek the relative corresponding to *qui* "sometimes implies a *cause, reason, occasion, motive*, or something else, which would properly be expressed by a conjunction. E. g. Θαυμαστὸν ποιεῖς ὃς ἡμῖν οὐδὲν δίδωσ, thou behavest strangely, *who* givest us nothing; i. e. *that* or *in that* thou givest us nothing." See Buttmann's Larger Greek Grammar, § 143. 1, and compare Kühner, § 334. 2, where the same fact is recognized.

* In Grabe's edition, c. 39.

one or two words to certain terms sometimes used in connection with baptism, falls very far short of proving the point assumed. The context is against it; for the context directs our attention to *Christ* and what he himself, personally, came to do for the human family. It is by *him*, and not by baptism, that they are here said to be renewed, born anew, or regenerated. And parallel passages are against it; for they abundantly confirm the sense which I have given, as being the true sense of the passage before us. Some of these are the following: —

When our Lord became incarnate and was made man, he summed up anew, in himself, the long array of men, affording us salvation in a compendious manner, so that what we had lost in Adam, that is, to be according to the image and similitude of God, we might regain in Christ. III. 18 : 1. (in G. c. 20.)

Unless man were united with God, he could not partake of incorruption. For it became the Mediator between God and men, by his intimate connection with both, to bring both together into friendship and concord, and on the one hand to present man to God, and on the other to make known God to men. For in what manner could we become partakers of the adoption of sons, unless through the Son we receive again from him that communion which there is with himself,— unless his Word, being made flesh, communicate it to us? Wherefore also he passed through every age, restoring to all that communion which there is with God. III. 18 : 7. (in G. c. 20, near the end.)

And for this cause [the heretic Mark represents] that man, according to Moses, was made on the *sixth* day, and moreover that in the economy on the sixth day,

which is the Preparation, the last man appeared for the regeneration of the first man. Of which economy [the suffering of Christ], it is asserted, the beginning and the end was that sixth hour on which he was affixed to the cross ; because the perfect mind, knowing the number *six* to have the power of making and regenerating, has manifested to the sons of light that regeneration which was accomplished by him who appeared prominent at that number. I. 14 : 6. (in G. c. 10.)

What Irenæus is here animadverting upon are the idle and cabalistic speculations concerning the numbers, in respect to events acknowledged by all. Elsewhere he says :—

. . . And signifying that it is he [our Lord] who has summed up anew, in himself, all nations scattered abroad from Adam, and every language and generation of men, with Adam himself. III. 22 : 3. (in G. c. 33.)

For the Lord, who was born, is *the first-begotten of the dead* ; and receiving the pristine fathers into his bosom, he regenerated them unto the life of God, being himself made the commencement of the living, as Adam was made the commencement of the dying. On account of this, also, Luke traces back to Adam the genealogical series, beginning it from the Lord, — thus signifying that He has regenerated them unto the gospel of life. . . . Thus, too, the knot of Eve's disobedience was untied by Mary's obedience. For what the virgin Eve bound by unbelief, the virgin Mary loosed by faith. III. 22 : 4. (in G. c. 33.)

And on account of this, in the end, he himself exhibited the similitude : The Son of God was made man, taking up into himself the ancient formation ; as we

have shown in the preceding book. IV. 33 : 4. (in G. c. 59.) See III. 18 : 1 with 7, and 16 : 6.

They who predicted the Emmanuel who was to be born of a virgin, manifested the union of the Word of God with what he had formed, that the Word should become flesh, and the Son of God the son of man ; (the pure one purely opening the pure womb,— that *which regenerates men unto God*,* and which he himself made pure;) and though he became what we are, he is the mighty God, and has an extraction that cannot be declared. IV. 33 : 11. (in G. c. 66.)

. . . Our Lord . . . bringing man again into connection with God, by his incarnation. V. 1 : 1.

But what he appeared, this he also was ; God, summing up anew in himself the ancient formation of man, that he might slay sin, make death void, and give life to man. III. 18 : 7. (in G. c. 20.)

. . . The Son of God, being made a man among men, formed the human race afresh. IV. 24 : 1. (in G. c. 41.)

God the Father had compassion on what he had formed, and gave it salvation, restoring it by his Word, that is, by Christ ; that man may learn by experience that he receives imperishableness, not from himself, but by the gift of God. V. 21 : 3.

Tertullian, about forty years after the time when these passages were written, gave a similar representation. In his treatise on the Flesh or Body of Christ (c. 17), he says : But first of all is to be set forth the reason that the Son of God should be born of a virgin. It became him to be born in a new manner, as he was the author of a new nativity ; concerning which, when

* Quæ regenerat homines in Deum.

God was about to give a sign, it was predicted by Isaiah. What was that sign? Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and shall bring forth a son. A virgin therefore conceived, and brought forth Emmanuel, God with us. This is a new nativity, since man is born in God; in which man God has been born,* the flesh of the ancient seed being assumed, without the ancient seed, so that by the new seed, that is, spiritually, he might form that flesh anew, it being purified and the defilement of its ancient state removed. But this whole newness, as also it has been done in all things, was of old represented in a figure, our Lord being born of a virgin in accordance with a reasonable arrangement. The earth was still a virgin, not yet compressed by tillage, not yet subjected to the sower: from it we have received man made by God for a living soul. Therefore, if the first Adam is given from the earth, with good reason the new Adam, as the apostle has said, has been produced by God for a quickening spirit, equally from the earth, that is, from flesh not yet unsealed for generating. But, lest I should not avail myself of the mention of the name of Adam, why has Christ been called Adam by the apostle, if man did not belong to his earthly census? Here also reason alleges that God, by a rival operation, has regained his image and similitude which were taken away by the Devil. For into Eve, still a virgin, had crept the word causing death. Into a virgin, too, was to be introduced the word of God, productive of life; that what by such a sex had gone off to perdition might by the same sex be brought back to salvation. Eve had believed the serpent; Mary believed Gabriel. What

* Dum homo nascitur in Deo; in quo homine Deus natus est.

sin the former committed by believing, the latter blotted out by believing. But Eve then conceived nothing in her womb from the word of the Devil. Nay, she did conceive. For, after that, as abject, she should obey, and in pangs bring forth. The word of the Devil impregnated her, and she brought forth a devil, a fratricide. On the other hand, Mary brought forth Him who should at length save Israel, the carnal brother, his murderer. Into the womb, therefore, God brought down his Word, the good brother, that he might efface the remembrance of the bad brother. Christ had to come forth thence for the salvation of man, whither man, already condemned, had entered. . . . (c. 20.) What there is new in Christ's being born of a virgin is manifest; namely, that it was of a virgin, according to the reason which we have given; and that a virgin might be our regeneration, . . . sanctified through Christ.

In his work against Marcion, B. III. c. 9, Tertullian expresses himself thus: Christ in respect to the flesh had to be born of the flesh, that by his nativity he might form anew our nativity; and thus also might by his death dissolve our death, by rising again in the flesh, in which he was born that he might be able also to die.

II. In another class of passages, Irenæus teaches that the extraordinary generation of Christ, which, he says, was given for a sign of salvation, must be received by faith: we must, as it were, come into it, and accede to the divinely appointed arrangement.

Alluding to the wiles of that old serpent, the tempter, as recorded in the third chapter of Genesis, and to the account given in the book of Numbers (xxi. 8), and to

the words of our Lord, in the Gospel according to John (iii. 14 and 15, and xii. 32), he says it was taught that men cannot be saved from the ancient sting of the serpent, unless they believe in Him who, in the likeness of our sinful flesh, was on the cross lifted up from the earth. IV. 2 : 7. (in G. c. 5.)

He asks, How shall man come to God, unless God come to man? How indeed shall he leave the generation of death, if he does not come into the new generation wonderfully and unexpectedly given by God for a sign of salvation,— the regeneration which is from the virgin through faith? Or what adoption shall they receive from God who remain in this generation which is according to man in the world? IV. 33 : 4. (in G. c. 59.) In other places he teaches thus:—

Those of the human race who believe God, and follow his word, receive that salvation which is from him. IV. 33 : 15. (in G. c. 66)

In respect to condition, so to speak, we are all children of God because we are all made by him. But as to obeying him and receiving his doctrine, all are not children of God, but they who believe him, and do his will. IV. 41 : 2. (in G. c. 79.)

The Ebionites are unreasonable, not receiving into their mind by faith the union of God and man, but persevering in the old leaven of generation; not willing to understand that the Holy Spirit came upon Mary, and the power of the Highest overshadowed her. Wherefore also what was generated is holy, and the Son of the most high God, the Father of all, who performed his incarnation, and exhibited the new generation; that, as by the former generation we have inherited death, so by this generation we might inherit life. V. 1 : 3.

But who are they that are here saved, and receive eternal life? Is it not they who love God, and who believe his promises, and in respect to malice are made little ones? IV. 28 : 3. (in G. c. 47.)

The Lord descended into those places which are under the earth, preaching also to them his advent; there being remission of sins to those who believe on him. But on him they all believed who hoped in him; that is, who foretold his advent, and complied with his arrangements,—the just men and prophets, and patriarchs, to whom he remitted sins in the same manner as to us. . . . For *all men come short of the glory of God*; and they who regard his light are glorified, not by themselves, but by the Lord's advent. IV. 27 : 2. (in G. c. 45.)

Irenæus, in giving a summary of the doctrine taught by the Apostles, proceeds to say in reference to our Lord, That they who believe in him shall be incorruptible and incapable of suffering, and receive the kingdom of heaven. IV. 24 : 2. He quotes as authoritative the passage, 1 John, v. 1, Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God. III. 16 : 8. And says, Jesus Christ our Lord makes them who believe in his name children of God. III. 6 : 2.

III. At the same time, in our being renewed in our minds and prepared for heaven, he often ascribes an essential influence to the Holy Spirit:

Thus therefore God was manifested; for through all these things God the Father is shown, the Spirit indeed operating, the Son ministering, the Father approving, and man consummated to salvation. IV. 20 : 6. (in G. c. 37.)

. . . Signifying that Christ would from among free-men and servants make children of God, giving alike to us all the gift of the Spirit that quickens us. IV. 21 : 3. (in G. c. 38.)

For by the hands of the Father, that is, by the Son and the Spirit, man is made according to the likeness of God. V. 6 : 1.

He quotes the Epistle to the Ephesians (i. 13), — In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation ; in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance, — and then adds : Thus therefore this the pledge dwelling in us now makes us spiritual. . . . Yet this is done, not by ceasing to have flesh, but by having the communion of the Spirit. For they to whom the Apostle wrote were not without flesh, but they had received the Spirit of God *by which we cry, Abba, Father.* V. 8 : 1.

He alludes to the grafting of the olive : — As the wild olive inserted loses not the substance of its wood, but changes the quality of its fruit, and takes another name, being now no longer a wild olive, but a fruitful olive ; thus also the man inserted by faith, and receiving the Spirit of God, loses not the substance of his flesh, but changes the quality of his fruit, his works, and receives another name, signifying that change which is for the better ; he is now denominated, not flesh and blood, but a spiritual man. Moreover, as the wild olive, if it does not receive insertion, continues useless to its owner, through its wild quality, and as the unfruitful wood is cut down and cast into the fire ; so also the man not receiving by faith the insertion of the Spirit continues to be what he was before : being flesh

and blood, he cannot inherit the kingdom of God. V. 10 : 2. And after illustrating and confirming these sentiments at some length, he concludes by quoting the words of the Apostle (Rom. viii. 14), For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.

In another passage he says: And again, giving to the disciples the authority of regeneration unto God, he said to them, Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. For by the prophets he promised to pour this out in the last times upon his servants and handmaids, that they might prophesy. Whence also he descended on the Son of God, made the son of man, accustoming himself to dwell with the human race, and to rest on men, and to dwell with what God had made, working the will of the Father in them, and renewing them from their old condition to the new condition in Christ. III. 17 : 1. (in G. c. 19.)

Here it seems too obvious to require any comment, that Irenæus contemplated the conversion of persons whose minds should be enlightened by evangelical instruction, and influenced by the Holy Spirit; and who, by being baptized, should make a suitable profession of their faith. At the same time, it ought to be known that he attributed to our baptism some special efficacy; for it may be useful to see the germ of an opinion which soon came to exert great influence. The extent of the efficacy alluded to is very distinctly expressed in the following passage: That union which is unto incorruption our bodies have received by the laver, but our minds by the Spirit. Whence also both are necessary; since both are profitable in respect to the life of God. III. 17 : 2. A similar efficacy he attributes also to the

eucharist : — Our bodies upon receiving the eucharist, he says, are no longer corruptible, but have the hope of the eternal resurrection. IV. 18: 5. (in G. c. 34.) See also V. 2 : 3. With this it may be well to connect what he had affirmed just before, namely : But altogether vain are they who contemn the whole arrangement of God, and deny the salvation of the flesh, and spurn its regeneration, saying that it is not capable of incorruptibility. V. 2 : 2.

Clement of Alexandria, writing near the close of the second century, uses the following remarkable expressions : — Knowledge, therefore, is illumination, which removes ignorance, and gives perspicacity. Now the rejection of the bad is the bringing of the good to light ; for what ignorance has sadly bound, is happily loosed by knowledge. And these bands are quickly dissolved *by faith indeed on the part of man, but by grace on the part of God* ; our sins being removed by one healing remedy, BAPTISM, RECEIVED IN THE DUE EXERCISE OF THE MIND. See his work entitled The Pedagogue, B. I. c. 6.*

* Φωτισμὸς ἄρα ἡ γνῶσις ἔστιν, ὁ ἐξαφανίζων τὴν ἀγνοιαν καὶ τὸ διορατικὸν ἐντιθείσ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ τῶν χειρόνων ἀποβολὴ, τῶν κρειττόνων ἔστιν ἀποκάλυψις. ἂ γὰρ ἡ ἀγνοια συνέδησε κακῶς, ταῦτα διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως ἀναλύεται καλῶς. τὰ δὲ δεσμὰ ταῦτα, ἢ τάχος, ἀνίεται πίστει μὲν ἀνθρωπίῃ, θεῖκῃ δὲ τῇ χάριτι· ἀφιεμένων τῶν πλημμελημάτων ἐνὶ παιωνίῳ φαρμάκῳ λογικῷ βαπτίσματι. Literally, *logical or reasonable baptism*.

All must admit that, in the paragraph quoted, there is a decided pointing to an activity of the human soul in the act of Christian initiation.

That a word must sometimes be rendered paraphrastically, in order to give the true sense, I need not labor to prove ; and that the Greek adjective *logikos* (*λογικός*), not indeed uniformly, nor usually, but in such a connection as the one before us, ought to be rendered in some such manner as I have ren-

Like Clement, Irenæus seems to have taken it for granted that baptism was received in the exercise of reason and of faith, and that, as being a most emphatic expression of faith on the part of men, it was preëminently connected with grace on the part of God.

If we bear this in mind, it will help very much towards explaining a passage in which he speaks of certain persons thus: They were sent by Satan to deny the baptism of regeneration unto God, and reject the

dered it in the text, is confirmed, if I mistake not, by certain other passages in which it occurs.

Clement, in his Exhortation to the Heathen, c. 10, after speaking of their perverse and unreasonable state, invites them to receive ὕδωρ λογικόν, *logical* water; i. e. the baptism which involves the reception of a soul-purifying and reasonable religion; and he assures them, ‘Yours is the kingdom of heaven, if ye will, having made the firm resolve for God; yours, if ye be willing only to believe, and to follow the compendium of what is preached.’ In his Pedagogue, B. I. c. 12, he mentions λογικὰ φάρμακα, *logical* medicines; i. e. medicines not only devised by our great Physician, but also suitable to be received by the soul of a rational being. And in his Stromata, B. V. c. 11, he speaks of knowledge as being λογικὸν βρῶμα, *logical* food; i. e. food adapted to and received by the soul. In 1 Pet. ii. 2, λογικὸν γάλα, *logical* milk, doubtless means nutriment for the mind. In the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (Levi, § 3), an apocryphal work written so early as to be mentioned by Origen, the angels of the divine presence in heaven are said to offer to the Lord λογικὴν προσφοράν, a *logical* oblation; i. e. the homage that is presented by a devout spirit. Thus, too, in Rom. xii. 1, the sense of the original would probably be expressed, were we to let the apostle say, ‘I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present yourselves a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God,—the service which is performed in the due exercise of your minds,—that is, the service in which your very souls are to be worthily occupied, and not that which is satisfied with merely external, ritual observances.’ Jaspis, in his elegant Latin version of the Epistles, here translates the Greek words to which I particularly refer, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν, “Dei cultum mente præstandum,” *that worship of God which is to be presented by the mind.*

whole faith. I. 21: 1. (in G. c. 18.) He contended, as we have already seen, that 'our bodies' were affected 'by the laver, but our minds by the Spirit,' so that both were renewed or regenerated, and united to God ; — we being understood to have received the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel in the liveliest exercise of faith, at the moment of our baptism. He, it had already been stated by Irenæus, he who retains unwavering in himself the rule of truth, which he received along with baptism, will acknowledge the terms derived from the Scriptures, and the readings, and the parables. I. 9 : 4. (in G. c. 1, near the end.)

On this passage, Massuet, the editor of the most valuable and complete edition of Irenæus, (which was published at Venice, in 1734,) has the following note :— 'He means the general faith, that especially, as he himself explains in the next chapter, which is in one God, the Father almighty ; and in one Jesus Christ, the Son of God, incarnate for our salvation ; and in the Holy Spirit who foretold by the prophets the arrangements of God, and the advent, and that generation which is from the Virgin, and the passion, etc. This faith Irenæus represents as having been received along with baptism, as what the Catechumens were taught so accurately before baptism, and what in baptism itself they professed, according to the words of its institution ; as Tertullian states in his book on Public Shows. . . . To this faith received in baptism and solemnly sworn to, almost all the holy Fathers who have written against the heretics have referred, supposing that nothing is more efficacious for refuting the novelty of profane dogmas. . . . But the more boldly did our author urge this kind of argument against the Valentinians, because

they had impiously rejected the whole of the apostolic symbol or creed which was professed by those who were to be baptized.'

In another place Irenæus says : And since in that formation which was according to Adam, man made in transgression needed the laver of regeneration, after he [the Saviour] put clay on his [the blind man's] eyes, he said to him, *Go to Siloam and wash*, at the same time restoring to him both the formation and that regeneration which is by the laver. And on account of this, when washed, he came seeing, so that he might know him by whom he was formed, and recognize him who gave him life. V. 15 : 3. And in one of his Fragments* on the book of Kings is found the following paragraph : It was not in vain that anciently the leprous Naaman was cleansed upon being baptized, but it was for our instruction ; who, being leprous in sins, are by the holy water and the calling upon the Lord cleansed from the old transgressions, as new-born children, being spiritually regenerated, according to what our Lord said : Except any one be born again, by water and the Spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.

How much of the representation in these two passages is fanciful, and how much evangelical, it is not necessary to determine. It is sufficient to know, and I do not hesitate to admit, that Irenæus sometimes speaks of a regeneration as being connected with baptism. And, in view of the many passages which have been adduced, it surely cannot be denied that he also sometimes speaks of a regeneration, and sometimes uses some kindred term, in various other connections.

* Ex Ms. Bibliothecæ Coislianæ Catena.

With baptism he associated the decisive reception of the true Christian faith, and transition from the world into the church, from a state of bondage to a state of redemption, from spiritual death to spiritual life. In some degree at least, he confounded the sign with the thing signified. This, it is well known, was done too generally, even in his early time. And thus occasion was given for some of the Gnostics to object, that an undue efficacy was attributed to baptism. One extreme is apt to produce its opposite. Hence, it seems, they rejected what he denominates the baptism of regeneration. And to his strong statement of this he adds the following: But they say that redemption belongs necessarily to them who have received the perfect knowledge, so that they are regenerated unto the power that is over all; for that otherwise it is impossible to enter within the Fulness (*ἐντὸς πληρώματος*), since it is this that leads them into the Profundity (*τὸ βάθος*). Indeed, it is said that the baptism of the appearing Jesus was of the forgiveness of sins, but that the redemption of Christ who descended upon him was unto perfection. The one, they assert, was animal; the other, spiritual; and the baptism of John was announced unto repentance; but the redemption was procured by Jesus unto perfection; and that it is this concerning which he says, *I have another baptism to be baptized with, and very much do I hasten to it.* And to the sons of Zebedee, when their mother requested of the Lord to seat them with him in his kingdom on his right hand and on his left, they say that he set forth this redemption, saying, *Can ye be baptized with the baptism that I am about to be baptized with?* And they affirm that Paul has often expressly mentioned *the redemption that is in*

Christ Jesus. I. 21: 1 and 2 (in G. c. 18.) Compare
§ 4.

Irenæus himself, as we have seen, does not always confound baptism with regeneration, renewal, restoration, or introduction to a better state. Often, when he speaks of these, he has in view the incarnation and mediatorial work of Christ, as bringing the human family into a new relation to God. He gives great prominence to faith and to the Holy Spirit, in whatever connection they may appear. And in a Fragment of his that remains,* he says: The first thing is to deny one's self, and follow Christ; and they who do thus go on unto perfection, performing all the will of the Teacher, being children of God by *the spiritual regeneration* ($\deltaι\alpha\tau\eta\varsigma\pi\alpha\lambda\iota\gamma\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\tau\eta\varsigma\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\eta\varsigma$), and heirs of the kingdom of heaven; for they who seek this first shall not be deserted.

* Ex Codicibus manuscriptis Bibliothecæ Regiæ Turinensis.

REPRESENTATIONS CONCERNING
BAPTISM,

IN

DR. ROBINSON'S LEXICON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT,

REVIEWED

By HENRY J. RIPLEY, D. D.

To THE REV. DR. RIPLEY.

Boston, March 31, 1850.

REV. AND VERY DEAR SIR:—The remarks which you have shown me on some representations in Dr. Robinson's Lexicon of the New Testament are so candid, pertinent, and convincing, that I trust you will let them be published. Highly as we esteem the learned author, we esteem the truth still more highly. He himself, as a scholar and as a Christian, cannot object to a frank avowal of your convictions, sustained as they are by a lucid and courteous statement of the reasons on which they rest. After you published your Examination of the much respected Professor Stuart's Essay on Baptism, I heard him speak strongly of the favorable impression which your work had made on his own mind. Let us hope that light and love will continue to increase among the disciples of Christ. Your compliance with what I have suggested will, I am confident, contribute greatly to promote such an increase.

As ever, yours with fraternal affection,

I. C.

REPLY.

MY DEAR BROTHER:—Agreeably to your request, I place at your disposal my remarks on Dr. Robinson's

Lexicon. As the article of which they are a part was designed for publication in a review, more topics, originally, were treated than at present appear, and such as do not come sufficiently within your purpose to be retained. It was commenced soon after the appearance of the Lexicon ; and when almost completed, I gave intimation of it to the editor of the Christian Review ; but, in reply, was informed that a distinguished Biblical scholar, and personal friend of ours, had already proposed to furnish a review of the Lexicon. I could not but be pleased with the expectation of a learned and satisfactory article from his pen. Still I completed what I had begun ; and I now comply with your request, through a desire to contribute my inconsiderable quota to the increase of light and love and obedience among the disciples of our common Lord.

With fraternal affection and with much respect,

I am yours,

H. J. RIPLEY.

Newton Theological Institution,

May 2, 1851.

REMARKS ON DR. ROBINSON'S LEXICON.*

THE reputation of Dr. Robinson in Biblical Literature is so well established, that the present edition of his Lexicon of the New Testament will of course be received with favor. It has unquestionable claims to favor. It is a good specimen of such a Lexicon, in its minuteness as to the signification of words and phrases, and its condensed information in Biblical geography, history, and exegesis. To a considerable extent, it answers the purpose of a concordance, and puts a student in possession of materials for making his own commentary.

In using a Lexicon of the New Testament, it is important to remember that in such a work, as in a commentary, an author's theological views will appear and will influence his representations of the meaning of words; though, justly speaking, theological views ought to be moulded by the philology of the Lexicon. We are entitled to expect in a Lexicon impartiality, or freedom from all extraneous bias in fixing the definitions of

* A Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament. By Edward Robinson, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Biblical Literature in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. A new Edition, revised and in great part rewritten. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers. 1850.

words; for a Lexicon professes faithfully to collect and record facts, as to the meaning of words and phrases, and should, therefore, have the justice and coolness of history. Literary justice would be disregarded should an author attempt, when philology requires of him an account of a word unaccordant with his predilections, to neutralize the proper influence of the account he gives.

The decisions of a Lexicon, it should also be remembered, are by no means final; they are only the conclusions which its author has formed from the resources within his reach; and those resources may have been, in the case of any word, copious or meagre, and may have been judiciously employed or otherwise. There always lies an appeal from the Lexicon to the authors in the original language, or to the original passages in which a word occurs. A student should form the habit of going back, as far as his means allow, to original sources, thus making himself independent even of lexicons. As lexicons present the conclusions of their authors, it is desirable also to have several, so that the deficiencies of one may be supplied by the fulness of another, and the errors of one, occasioned by the numerous untoward influences felt in the domain of theological literature, may be rectified by the more impartial conclusions of another.

We have been led into this train of thought, probably, by the manner in which the author treats the word *βαπτίζω* baptizo. After presenting a just view of its use among classic Greek writers, he proceeds to its use in the New Testament, and states as the first meaning, *to wash, to lave, to cleanse by washing*. As an authority for, or illustration of, this indefinite signification, he

produces Luke xi. 38, in which $\epsilon\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\sigma\theta\eta$ ebaptisthe occurs, and compares it with Mark vii. 2, 3, where $\nu\acute{i}\psi\omega\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ nipsōntai occurs, the circumstances in the two cases being represented by Dr. Robinson as alike. Mark vii. 4, in which $\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\sigma\omega\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ baptisōntai occurs, is also referred to. The author's judgment, apparently, is that the words in these instances are used alike, and that $\nu\acute{i}\pi\tau\omega$ nipto, *wash*, serves to explain $\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\zeta\omega$ baptizo, *baptize*.

This judgment is certainly incorrect. A careful examination of the verses cited from Mark shows that two quite diverse cases are there spoken of, one requiring a comparatively slight washing ($\nu\acute{i}\psi\omega\nu\tau\alpha\iota$), and the other a copious ablution ($\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\sigma\omega\nu\tau\alpha\iota$). With this latter case corresponds the one mentioned in Luke xi. 38 ($\epsilon\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\sigma\theta\eta$). The very candid view taken of Mark vii. 2 – 4 by Dr. George Campbell, in the Notes to his translation of the Four Gospels, is worthy of careful consideration. He translates the passage in the following manner: “For the Pharisees . . . eat not until they have washed their hands by pouring a little water upon them; and if they be come from the market, by dipping them.” In his Note, he says: “For illustrating this passage, let it be observed that the two verbs rendered *wash* in the English translation are different in the original. The first is $\nu\acute{i}\psi\omega\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ nipsōntai, properly translated *wash*; the second is $\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\sigma\omega\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ baptisōntai, which limits us to a particular mode of washing; for $\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\zeta\omega$ baptizo denotes *to plunge*, *to dip*. . . . By this interpretation, the words, which, as rendered in the common version, are unmeaning, appear both significant and emphatical; and the contrast in the Greek is preserved in the translation.”

More modern writers, of the first ability, also differ from the author of this Lexicon. Olshausen, on Mark vii. 2, 3, after saying that the Evangelist felt it necessary to explain to readers who were not Jews the Jewish custom of washing the hands before meals, thus proceeds : “ Mark passes on from the custom of washing hands to similar customs ; for washings of every sort were customary among the Jews ; he ends, however, with the washing relative to provisions. *Βαπτίζεσθαι* baptizesthai differs from *νίπτεσθαι* niptesthai. The former is here the immersing and cleaning off of provisions that had been purchased, in order to remove every possible impurity which might have been on them. *Νίπτεσθαι* niptesthai embraces also a rubbing off, since such an act occurs in every form of washing.”

C. F. A. Fritzsche, in his Commentary on Mark, after a very copious discussion of the passage, presents the following views. “ Verse 4. And when they have come from the market, that is, from business in the market, they do not eat unless they have washed their body. Thus Beza and Grotius explain this passage. Most rightly.” In alluding to a possible charge of tautology in this interpretation, he remarks : “ So far from there being tautology in this method, the writer advances to a still stronger case. The Pharisees, says Mark, according to traditional precepts, do not eat bread unless after having carefully washed their hands. And when they have come from the market, they do even more ; namely, they do not take food *unless they have washed their body.* The Pharisees judged it necessary to wash their bodies on returning from the market, because there was ground for fear lest in a public concourse they should, even through imprudence, have con-

tracted some serious defilement, as they might have either ignorantly fallen in with an unclean man, or incautiously touched some very impure thing." In reference to Kuinoel's remark that antiquity bears no testimony to the practice among the Pharisees of washing their persons before meals, after returning from the market, he says, "The testimony of antiquity which Kuinoel required is in the New Testament itself, in Luke xi. 37, 38."

De Wette, after assenting to the insertion, for explaining the Evangelist's idea, of the clause *when they have returned* before the clause *from the market*, adds: "This explanation receives a better sense when, with Beza, Grotius, Fritzsche, we understand βαπτίζεσθαι baptizesthai of the whole body, than with Lightfoot and Wetstein merely of the hands."

H. A. W. Meyer, in his Manual on the Gospels of Mark and Luke, has the following note: "The expression in Mark vii. 4 (ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσωνται) is not to be understood of the *washing of the hands* (as interpreted by Lightfoot and Wetstein), but of the *immersing* which the word always means in the Classics and the New Testament; that is, here, according to the context, *the taking of a bath*. So likewise Luke xi. 38. Having come from the market, where among a crowd of men they might have come in contact with unclean persons, they eat not without having first bathed themselves. The representation proceeds after the manner of a climax: before eating they *always* observe the washing of hands, but [employ] the *bath* when they come *from the market* and wish to take food."

It is no part of my object here to determine whether βαπτίσωνται baptisontai relates to the persons spoken of,

or, as Olshausen and others suppose, to provisions which had been purchased in the market; nor even whether it relates to the entire body or only to the hands. This is wholly unnecessary so far as the meaning of the word is concerned; since, in either case, the difference between this word and *νίπτεσθαι* niptesthai is perfectly obvious. My purpose has been to show that Dr. Robinson's judgment in regard to Mark vii. 2, 3, as employing *νίπτω* nipto and *βαπτίζω* baptizo in the same sense opposes leading authorities of the present age. So far as *βαπτίζω* baptizo is concerned, his Lexicon cannot be regarded as a "memorial of the progress and condition of the Interpretation and Lexicography of the New Testament, at the close of the first half of the nineteenth century."

Dr. Robinson produces in this connection the two Hebrew words לִבְשׁ and נִפְגַּשׁ, apparently as illustrating the resemblance between *βαπτίζω* baptizo and *νίπτω* nipto. The comparison fails, however; for the relation between the two Hebrew words, as is evident from the very passages he quotes, 2 Kings v. 14 compared with 10, is not the same as between *βαπτίζω* baptizo and *νίπτω* nipto, but the same as between *βαπτίζω* baptizo and λούω louo; the two words, both in Hebrew and Greek, being so related, that, when the prophet Elisha directed Naaman to go and *wash* (נִפְגַּשׁ, λοῦσαι lousai, properly *bathe*) in the Jordan, Naaman went and *dipped* (לִבְשׁ, ἐβαπτίζατο ebaptizato) himself. Now, while λούω louo and *βαπτίζω* baptizo are thus kindred in idea, λούω louo and *νίπτω* nipto are distinct from each other; as appears from the Gospel of John xiii. 10. In this passage it is said that a person who has been *bathed*, λελούμενος leloumenos, needs after that copious use of

water only *to wash*, *νιψασθαι* nipsasthai, his feet. The distinction between *νίπτω* nipto and *λούω* louo is here obvious. Equally obvious is the distinction between *νίπτω* nipto and *βαπτίζω* baptizo. The cases in John xiii. 10 and Mark vii. 2, 3 are remarkably similar as to the relation of these several verbs; and amply show how uncritical it is to regard *βαπτίζω* baptizo and *νίπτω* nipto as interchangeable and as indiscriminately employed.

Two passages are also produced from the Apocrypha as confirming the statement that *βαπτίζω* baptizo bears the general signification of *washing*. In these passages, however, the cases referred to are such that a very *copious* use of water is intended to be expressed, and not *washing* merely, without necessary reference to the idea of copiousness.

Appended to the article we have been considering is a Note, designed to support the opinion that "in Hellenistic usage, and especially in reference to the rite of baptism, *βαπτίζω* baptizo would seem to have expressed not always simply *immersion*, but the more general idea of *ablution* or *affusion*." It ingenuously acknowledges that "in Greek writers, from Plato onwards, *βαπτίζω* baptizo is everywhere *to sink*, *to immerse*, *to overwhelm*, either wholly or partially." The opinion above stated the author, however, labors to confirm by the following considerations.

1. "The circumstances narrated in Luke xi. 37, 38 compared with those in Mark vii. 2-4." These passages have been already sufficiently examined. A word or two more may seem requisite in regard to *βαπτισμόν* baptismous in the fourth verse of the passage in Mark, as applied to cups, pots, brazen vessels, and tables. No valid objection against the specific meaning

of the word can arise from its use in this connection, since all these articles, even the more bulky ones, were capable of immersion, part by part, if not the whole at once ; and the more bulky articles were expressly required by later Jewish regulations to be actually covered with water in order to be cleansed. In regard to the smaller articles, we find in Lev. xi. 32 the direction, that any vessel on which the dead body of an unclean animal had fallen,— and Jewish scrupulosity would, doubtless, in subsequent times, extend the rule to all cases of defilement, real or presumed,— “ whatsoever vessel it be wherein any work is done,” (except only earthen vessels, which, when polluted, were to be broken in pieces, Lev. xi. 33,) “ it must be *put into water*” in order to be cleansed. Meyer, also, whom we have already quoted, says of *βαπτισμούς* baptismous in this verse: “ It is to be understood of the cleaning off by *dipping in.*”

2. Another consideration adduced to sustain the indefinite signification of the word in question is, that “ in Acts ii. 41 three thousand persons are said to have been baptized at Jerusalem apparently in one day at the season of Pentecost in June ; and in Acts iv. 4 the same rite is necessarily implied in respect to five thousand more. Against the idea of full *immersion* in these cases there lies a difficulty, apparently insuperable, in the scarcity of water. There is in summer no running stream in the vicinity of Jerusalem, except the mere rill of Siloam, a few rods in length ; and the city is and was supplied with water from its cisterns and public reservoirs. From neither of these sources could a supply have been well obtained for the immersion of eight thousand persons.”

We will repress levity, and in seriousness ask, If three thousand persons were baptized on one day and five thousand were subsequently baptized, whether on one day or at several different times, how does this furnish a ground for objecting that there was not water enough for immersing eight thousand persons? So far as the number is concerned, the entire statement of the sacred record is met by the opinion, generally received, that in Acts iv. 4 not a fresh addition of five thousand persons to the Christian company is meant, but that the company had increased to five thousand; and this increase was not, so far as appears, simultaneous, but gradual. Then as to the water itself, without starting the inquiry which the author's statement certainly suggests, How much water is consumed in baptizing a person? or, How many persons will any considerable mass of water allow to be baptized without being exhausted, or rendered unsuitable for the purpose? Without starting these inquiries, but limiting our view to the sufficiency of water in the city, we may, in the absence of precise testimony from ancient times, well believe that so populous a city as Jerusalem was not destitute of adequate supplies of water for the purpose, but that, as the ancient geographer Strabo testifies, it was "well watered"; especially as, by the prescriptions of their religion, all the adult males of the nation were required to repair to Jerusalem three times every year; and one of those times was the very festival which was occurring when the three thousand embraced the Christian religion. The burden of proof that Jerusalem was destitute of sufficient water and conveniences, in face of the acknowledged meaning of the word as commonly used, and in face of divinely appointed customs which

required large quantities of water both for religious purposes and for personal cleanliness, lies on those who raise the suspicion that Jerusalem was not able to furnish an adequate supply of water. This proof has never been given; and the subject is far enough from such a state as would authorize a departure, in sense, from the ordinary meaning of a word which a sacred writer has employed. Should researches continue to be made, we have a right to presume that, as has happened on other subjects and on other questions pertaining to baptism, the increasing light of science will confirm the plain, unsophisticated declarations of the Holy Scriptures.

Desirable as it is to oppose facts to doubts, we must sometimes be content to oppose probabilities to improbabilities, and wait for additional light. That additional light in regard to the present subject may never be attained; because the question relates to the ancient city, which has been so sadly devastated and has undergone so many changes. And yet, so far as explorations have been made which might create, or warrant, a general impression on the subject, a perusal of Dr. Robinson's Researches in Palestine (Vol. I. Section VII. Art. IX., on the Supply of Water in Jerusalem) and of the additions to the Researches grounded on communications from Messrs. Smith and Walcott, can hardly fail to produce conviction that a city, so wonderful for the labor and skill expended in securing immense quantities of water for both public and private use, could not have been destitute of places in which baptism, immersion we mean, could have been administered to an indefinite number of persons. When we read of remains of ancient reservoirs, in length 316 feet, in breadth from 200

to 218 feet, and 18 feet in depth; also, in length 592 feet, in breadth from 245 to 275 feet, and in depth from 35 to 42 feet, and when various notices of aqueducts and other means of supply pass before our minds, showing great amleness of accommodations for water and a most remarkable attention to the safety and comfort of the city in every vicissitude of circumstances, it does seem utterly unreasonable to cast suspicion on the meaning of the word *baptize* by the suggestion that the city could not supply a sufficient quantity of water for immersing so many as the inspired account may warrant us in saying were baptized. A more particular reference to the interesting facts presented in the works above named is unnecessary. Future years may bring to light other and still more definite facts; for the researches thus far made give stimulating promise of yet more wonderful disclosures to reward the enterprise of explorers, and to confirm the sacred records. In the mean time, the general impression from researches hitherto prosecuted is by no means adverse to the belief that the baptism in Jerusalem on the occasions referred to was, in accordance with the meaning of the word, a veritable immersion.

3. Another consideration produced by Dr. Robinson as adverse to the idea of immersion being involved in baptism is, that "in the earliest Latin versions of the New Testament, as, for example, the *Itala*, which Augustine regarded as the best of all, and which goes back apparently to the second century, and to usage connected with the apostolic age, the Greek verb *βαπτίζω* is uniformly given in the Latin form *baptizo*, and is never translated by *immergo*, or any like word; showing that there was something in the rite of baptism to which the latter did not correspond."

Without entering into the doubtful, and, for the present purpose, unnecessary inquiry, How far any existing Latin renderings belong to the genuine Itala, a satisfactory account can be given of the transfer of the Greek $\betaαπτίζω$ baptizo into the early Latin versions in preference to a real translation of that word. There is no necessity for supposing such a flexibility, or comprehensiveness, of meaning in the Greek word as would not allow any existing Latin word to be its representative. The supposition has been made that the earliest Latin versions, unless we may except the Itala, had their origin in Africa, where the Latin was generally used, but was not spoken, or written, in purity ; and where, of course, a word not of the genuine language, yet well understood, would without repugnance be adopted. Whatever may be in this, the expressing of the Greek word in a Latin form proves only that, at the very early period when Latin versions commenced, the word $\betaαπτίζω$ baptizo had come to be so associated with the sacred observance, and had become so familiar among the people for whom the versions were made, that it was naturally transferred, instead of being translated. It is by no means surprising, then, that, even among those Christians in the Roman empire who used mostly the Latin language, a classical or a colloquial Latin word was not employed in Latin translations instead of that to which, in sacred matters, they had become accustomed, and which was by usage as well understood as the corresponding genuine Latin word.

4. The remaining consideration presented in the Note is drawn from “ the baptismal fonts still found among the ruins of the most ancient Greek churches in Palestine, as at Tekoa and Gophna, and going back

ple to produce satisfaction, Dr. Robinson has produced but a single Biblical passage, Ex. vii. 15, in the Septuagint, as illustrating it; and, unhappily for his definition, the relation of that passage to the phrase does not appear. Perhaps it is an error of the press. But whether a misprint or not, whoever, in order to explain John iii. 23, will examine the passages in the New Testament in which this Hebraistic phrase occurs, Rev. i. 15; xiv. 2; xvii. 1, 15; xix. 6, and will then examine the places of its occurrence in the Septuagint and of the corresponding Hebrew phrase in the Hebrew Bible, 2 Sam. xxii. 17; Ps. xviii. 16; xxix. 3; xxxii. 6; lxxvii. 19; xciii. 4.; cvii. 23; cxliv. 7, and will also observe the usage of the Septuagint, in which *much water* and *many waters* are equivalent expressions, cannot admit the meaning ascribed to it in this Lexicon, but will feel compelled to translate it, in accordance with our version, *much water* and *many waters*.

The precise idea of a word is sometimes overlooked by Dr. Robinson, while he presents the essential meaning, though in a form diverse from that which the original writer employed, thus being logically correct, but not philologically, and therefore not giving a satisfactory account of the word. In the article on $\betaαπτίζω$ baptizo, for instance, he quotes a passage from Josephus, in which that writer says of certain robbers who had broken into Jerusalem, that "they baptized the city"; that is, says Dr. Robinson, "filled it with confusion and distress." This is substantially a true exhibition of the thought which Josephus conveyed, but the word *filled* is too remote from the original word to represent it. The more

kindred phraseology, “they *plunged* the city” into confusion, or “they *inundated*” or “*overwhelmed*” it with confusion, would present the original cast of the thought, and preserve verbal accuracy.

So, under the word *aīma*, *blood*, he gives the following explanation of our Lord’s idea in John vi. 53 – 58, where, he says, “the phrase *to eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ* signifies, ‘to receive Christ wholly into one’s self, so that he may become wholly united and incorporated with us, as food with the body, and we thus become partakers of that life which is in him’ ; comp. Gal. iv. 19 ; Col. i. 27 ; iii. 10.” Our Lord’s idea in this connection was not, we think, so definite and intensive. He rather meant to be understood as saying in general, that, as your bodily life is sustained by what you eat and drink, so by me only can you have spiritual life, or, from me must be derived spiritual aliment. But, however this may be, the several passages adduced do not illustrate the *language* of our Lord ; they present the same idea under as many different aspects. And while they help to a logical conception of the passage, they may, as thus presented, really hinder a student’s exact discrimination between the different shades of thought. We interpret a passage inaccurately, when, instead of seizing on the precise idea, or the form of thought, we express its meaning in terms equally adapted to several other different passages, and in all probability equally unadapted to the precise shade of thought in either of those passages.

Passing over some other unsatisfactory matter, and some deficiencies, it is gratifying to see so much space given to the explanation of particles. These are small words, but incalculably important in their influence on

the words to which they stand related. It is delightful, too, to meet here with so many instances in which a good Lexicon sheds a flood of light on a passage by explaining some one word, or by inserting an explanatory word or clause.

The preface to the work is richly instructive and satisfactory.

To have had occasion to say so much on the meaning of *βαπτίζω* baptizo is painful. The honest conclusions of philology ought, at length, to be acquiesced in, and not to be unsettled by suspicions and surmises more shadowy than real.

THE
SUFFICIENCY OF WATER FOR BAPTIZING,
AT JERUSALEM,
AND ELSEWHERE IN PALESTINE,
AS RECORDED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT ;
SET FORTH IN A LETTER
BY THE REV. GEORGE W. SAMSON.

THE

SUFFICIENCY OF WATER FOR BAPTIZING,
AT JERUSALEM, AND ELSEWHERE
IN PALESTINE.

TO THE REV. G. W. SAMSON.

Boston, April 1, 1851.

REV. AND VERY DEAR SIR,—As you have lately visited Palestine, and enjoyed ample means of becoming acquainted with the interesting localities of Jerusalem, and with other places connected with the history of baptism as presented in the New Testament, I have a request to make. It is this: That you communicate such facts as may illustrate the points discussed in Dr. Ripley's manuscript, which you saw at my house yesterday.

Yours, with much esteem and Christian love,

I. C.

REPLY.

REV. DR. CHASE:

Dear Sir,—You have asked me to note down some personal observations and impressions as to the facilities

offered for immersion at Jerusalem, and other localities in Palestine, where in the New Testament the rite of baptism is recorded to have been administered. It is no easy task you demand ; though at first it might seem a simple one. The eye certainly is the instructor of the mind, and the knowledge gained by sight is indeed the surest and most positive we can obtain ; yet many things come in to restrict the extent, and to modify the real value, of such knowledge. After all the crowds of Christian men that have traversed throughout the length and breadth of the Holy Land, there are some spots of interest which have not been sought out. Moreover, many that have been visited have been but imperfectly explored and more imperfectly described ; for only the jaded traveller himself knows how the fatigues of constant journeying take away the mind's stimulus and zest, and make the eye heavy and the pen sluggish over the evening journal. Yet again, scenes that are examined with leisure and interest take a form and a hue corresponding to our previous prepossessions ; things that one person would distinctly observe being unconsciously overlooked by another. And still once more, when the mind in distant, subsequent years endeavors to run back and review the thousand varied scenes long past from vision, the keenest observer and the most sincere and faithful chronicler will inevitably sometimes mistake the images of fancy for the remembrance of realities. “ Charity believeth all things, hopeth all things ” ; and a large measure of the exercise of that grace is justly due towards either of two travellers who may widely differ as to their statement of matters of eyesight, and as to impressions derived from scenes visited. I feel assured, therefore, that, in

reading this letter, you will not be hasty to detect any unjust censure of others who differ with the writer ; that you will feel the value of citations from the writings of men who travelled through Palestine in ages long gone by, before the difference of opinion now existing among Christians as to the mode of baptism had assumed its present marked tone, and when, therefore, men wrote free from the bias of prepossession ; and that, moreover, you will charitably excuse any statement of an impression which may seem to you to indicate that the writer's own mind has been warped from the nice line of a just conclusion, since the great Apostle evidently speaks of an attribute belonging only to the All-Perfect when he says, “ We know that the *judgment of God* is according to the truth.”

Some of the Ancient Chroniclers.

Before we enter, then, on our survey, allow me to recall from the treasures of your own lifetime's study the honored names of some of those men who have gone before us in their visits to the scenes where Christian baptism was first administered ; that thus, when we shall stand and view the localities they describe, we may be prepared rightly to weigh and to compare their testimony. First among the early Christian writers who particularly describe the places hallowed in the life of Christ is the famed Bourdeaux Pilgrim, who wrote in Latin an account of his visit to Palestine, A. D. 333. Previously to that age, indeed, numberless Christian scholars and pilgrims, as we know, had traversed the Holy Land, visiting its hallowed scenes ; for Jerome, in his beautiful eulogy on Paula, a Roman lady who was descended from the renowned Scipios, and who dur-

ing his day had visited Palestine, states, that great numbers of pilgrims, (to use his own words,) "*through all the ages from the ascension of the Lord to the time in which we live,*" journeyed through Palestine, among which pilgrims he mentions men from "India, Ethiopia, Britannia, Hibernia."* During that early age, however, the necessity had not yet arisen for any thing but a bare mention, such as Origen, for instance, makes, of the localities then well known; just as the time has not yet arrived when Americans need in a history of Washington any thing more than a mere reference to places now familiar, as Bunker Hill, Saratoga, and Yorktown. When, however, Christianity became the established religion of the Roman Empire, then detailed descriptions of places whose locality was known to residents of Palestine was demanded by distant believers in Christ; as localities in this country must be described to an Englishman, Frenchman, or Italian. When that necessity arose, the Grecian Eusebius, who was born at Cæsarea in Palestine, A. D. 270, and lived and died there, wrote an extended history of the Christian Church, and wrote also a description of localities in his native land hallowed in the life of Christ and of his Apostles. Then also Jerome, who had been baptized at Rome at about forty years of age, came and dwelt at Bethlehem, near Jerusalem, for more than thirty years, from A. D. 386 until his death, A. D. 420; preparing there his version of the Old Testament in Latin, and visiting again and again, and describing, the sacred spots of the Holy Land. The testimony of these early writers has been deemed invaluable on every point of

* Jerome, Epist. XXII.

Biblical geography ; and their statements, therefore, which may show the facilities for immersion at Jerusalem and in Palestine, are of the first importance. In the age next following, from the time of Constantine to the day when Jerusalem was taken by the followers of Mohammed, A. D. 637, pilgrims still flocked to tread the venerated soil ; as a specimen of whom may be mentioned Arculfus, a French bishop, who on his return from Palestine was cast away on the coast of Scotland, where a Scotch abbot named Adamnanus wrote out his account of his travels, and presented the record to King Alfred, A. D. 698. During the Mohammedan supremacy then succeeding, other adventurous Christian scholars recorded their travels in the Holy Land ; and when the Crusades restored the sacred places again to Christians, numberless chroniclers penned their notices ; some of which are of great value on the question we would investigate. Pages could be filled with merely the names of those who, in later centuries, down to our time, have visited and written descriptions of scenes in Palestine. Selecting from among the more valuable of these honest chroniclers, so far as their works are in our reach, and storing our memories with what they have recorded to aid our investigation, let us go, thus prepared to stand amid the scenes where Christ's Apostles baptized, and there examine for ourselves the facilities offered for immersion.

Supplies of Water at Jerusalem.

Perhaps the student of the New Testament finds most difficulty in accounting satisfactorily for the immersion of the great numbers converted in the early days of Christianity at *Jerusalem*. The facilities for

the performance of this rite in and about the Holy City, therefore, demand the first notice. The nearest living stream to Jerusalem in which immersion could be performed is the *Jordan*, which is distant fifteen miles, or about a five hours' journey ; and moreover there is no natural sheet of standing water within the same distance. The *brook* Kedron, often mentioned in the Old and New Testaments, is, as the original term indicates, nothing but the bed through which the rains of winter drain off between the eastern wall of the city and Mount Olivet ; and its channel is therefore dry in the early spring, several weeks before the period in the month of June when the feast of Pentecost occurred. Unfavorably situated, therefore, as this great capital is in reference to *natural* provisions for water, as might be expected, the arrangements for an *artificial* supply are on a scale peculiarly extensive. The cisterns, reservoirs, and pools prepared by Solomon, Hezekiah, and Herod (not to mention other rulers), for this purpose, have been the admiration of men from every part of the world in many a succeeding age. The *sources* from which this supply is obtained are principally *five* ; from a fine natural fountain or spring breaking forth from underneath the rocky rise on which the old temple stood ; from the winter rains, gathered as they fell into cisterns under the court-yards of private houses and of public buildings, such as the temple and the castles ; from the extensive drainage of the winter rains gathered from the northern and western hills, whose slope for a mile around converges into the valley of Gihon ; from a single large well, pierced to a great depth, in the valley of Hinnom ; and, finally, from natural springs in the hills seven or eight miles south of

the city, the waters of which springs are gathered first into a large underground reservoir, whence they flow through a narrow passage to three immense tanks some quarter of a mile distant, called "the Pools of Solomon," whence, again, they are conducted by a massive aqueduct to the city. It should perhaps be added, that though at present there is but a single natural spring in Jerusalem, and but a single well (and that a very deep one in the valley outside) fed by living springs, yet there were probably, before King Hezekiah's day, other fountains about the city. Solomon was crowned at "Gihon," which Josephus calls "the *fountain* of Gihon." Hezekiah "stopped the upper *watercourse* of Gihon," and "all the *fountains* without the city."* Perhaps, if excavations could be made, it would be found that the fountain now gushing so copiously from under the ancient temple area is furnished by concealed streams brought from without the city.† The settlement of this question, however, is unimportant to our present inquiry.

Various Facilities for Baptism common to most Eastern Towns.

It is worthy of a passing notice, that even the cisterns of Jerusalem are not unadapted to the rite of immersion. Any one who has visited the immense ancient reservoirs at Constantinople, or those about ancient Baiæ in Italy, will have some idea of what is found throughout Palestine, and especially at Jerusalem. The

* 1 Kings i. 33, 38; 2 Chron. xxxii. 3, 4, 30. Josephus, Ant. q., VII. 14. 5.

† See Robinson's Researches, Vol. I. p. 512; and Bibliotheca Sacra, Vol. III. pp. 634–638.

visitor descends by steps into a vast subterranean hall, sometimes covering acres in extent and supported by scores of columns, where water stands, increasing in depth as a person advances along the sloping bottom, offering the most favorable opportunity possible for immersion. Such cisterns even in Jacob's day seem to have existed in this land, where they are so much needed ; and the historian Moses, who had occasion often to allude to them, deems it of importance to mention, that the one into which Joseph was cast by his brethren " was empty, there was no water in it."* Many such reservoirs, *without water*, Dr. Robinson describes on the road from Jerusalem to Gaza.† Several such, of magnificent size, containing water deep enough for immersion, are found on the road from Jerusalem by the tomb of Moses to the Jordan.‡ Underneath the grotto of Jeremiah, near the northern wall of Jerusalem, is such a reservoir. Entering a side door and descending a few feet, the traveller finds himself in a fine anteroom, twenty or twenty-five feet square, cut in the rock. Passing through a side door and descending by a stairway twenty-five or thirty feet farther, he stands in a large subterranean hall, about sixty feet square, whose arched top is supported by columns, and whose sloping bottom is nearly covered with water ; into which he can descend to a considerable depth.

* Gen. xxxvii. 24.

† Robinson's Researches, Vol. II. pp. 353, 395 – 398.

‡ At a distance of 2h. 10m. from Neby Mousa on the road to Jerusalem, at a place called er-Reib er-Rohâwah, near the junction of Wady Rohâwah with Wady Sidr, are fine springs of water, and three noble reservoirs cut into the rocky side of the valley. Into one, which is about 25 by 40 feet, the entrance is by a doorway and staircase. Another, about 50 feet by 60, has an open front and a gradual slope to the water.

That such cisterns, and other facilities for bathing, were peculiarly abundant about the cities of Palestine in the age of the Apostles, Josephus is witness; who often mentions the aqueducts, and baths, and reservoirs, and costly fountains, which Herod before Christ's day built, and which after Christ's day existed in different towns of Judea, as Ascalon, Cæsarea, and Herodion, and in different quarters of Jerusalem, as under the towers of Hippicus and Phasaëlus, and of Antonia, "the castle" into which Paul was borne.* That such baths and cisterns were used by the Apostles for immersion seems to be indicated by the Bourdeaux Pilgrim, who, visiting the Cæsarea where Peter baptized Cornelius, about three hundred years after that event, records, "There is the bath of Cornelius the centurion, who did much alms."† The frequency with which such reservoirs are met, not only in Palestine, but in Southern Italy and the whole Levant, removes from the mind of the inquiring traveller all difficulty as to facilities for immersion at Jerusalem, Philippi, Corinth, Rome, and elsewhere, in the Apostles' day; as from the mind of the late Dr. Judson the same difficulty was removed by observing the baths in the jail-yards of Burmah and India. While, then, the *lexicographer* finds the meaning of the word used for this ordinance to be immersion, the ancient and the modern Christian traveller alike find no difficulty as to the means for immersion, even when he

* Josephus, *Antiq.*, XV. 9. 4 and 6; *Wars*, I. 21. 10 and 11; V. 4. 2; V. 5. 8.

† "Ibi est balneus Cornelii centurionis, qui multas elemosynas faciebat." The Itinerary is found, and can be readily consulted, in the Appendix to Chateaubriand's *Travels in Palestine*.

has examined only the *ordinary* conveniences for bathing in an Oriental city.

Pools at Jerusalem.

Passing, however, these facilities for immersion common to most Eastern towns, observe those peculiar accommodations offered at Jerusalem in the numerous large public *pools* of the city ; six of which will claim our special notice. In devout harmony of soul with the ancient Psalmist, loving as he did the truth and honor of God, seeing that Jerusalem's ancient "towers," and "bulwarks," and "palaces" are all laid low, take we up the *spirit* of his language : "Walk about Zion, and go round about her. See the *pools*, mark ye well her *fountains*, consider her *flowing waters*; that ye may tell it to the generation following."

1. The Pool of Bethesda.

Proceeding from the southern brow of Zion, where the Spirit of God is supposed to have been poured on the disciples of Jesus upon the memorable Pentecost, a few minutes walk brings us to the north of the ancient temple-area on Mount Moriah. Here, in the open air, by the side of the wall of the ancient temple inclosure, is a long, broad excavation into the earth, the sides of which are built up with masonry of small stones, whose surface is covered with a hard, smooth cement. According to Dr. Robinson's measurement it is 360 feet long, 130 feet broad, and 75 deep, being now partly filled with rubbish. The natives call it "*Birket Isrâîl*," — The Pool of Israel ; and the tradition of ages has declared it to be the ancient Pool of

Bethesda, mentioned in Christ's day.* Tacitus, the Roman historian, in describing the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans after Christ's day, says of the temple area : "There were *pools* and cisterns for preserving rain-water."† Eusebius, the Christian historian, three hundred years after Christ, speaks of the Pool of Bethesda thus : "Bexatha, a pool in Jerusalem which is the sheep-pool, anciently having five porticos ; and now it is shown in the double pool at the same place, one of which is filled by the yearly rains, and the other of which shows its water in a singular manner, tinged with red, bearing the mark, as they say, of the sacrificial victims anciently washed in it ; for which reason also it is called the sheep-pool, on account of the sacrifices."‡ Jerome a few years later wrote : "Bethesda, a pool in Jerusalem which is called προβατική probatikē, and may be interpreted by us *sheep-pool*. This had formerly five porches ; and there are shown two lakes ; one of which is usually filled by the winter rains ; the other of which, in a wonderful manner tinged with red, as if by bloody waters, witnesses the marks of the ancient work done in it. For they say that victims were washed in it by the priests, whence also it received its name."§ The testimony of

* John v. 2.

† "Piscinæ cisternæque, servandis imbribus." Tacitus, Hist., V. 12.

‡ "Βηξαθὰ κολυμβήθρα ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἣτις ἐστὶν ἡ προβατικὴ, τὸ παλαιὸν πέντη στοὰς ἔχουσα· καὶ νῦν δείκνυται ἐν ταῖς ἀντόθι λίμναις διδύμοις ὡν ἐκατέρα μὲν ἐκ τῶν κατ' ἔτος οὐετῶν πληροῦνται· θατέρα δὲ παραδόξως πεφοινιγμένων δείκνυσι τὸ ὑδωρ, ἵχνος, ὡς φασι, φέρουσα τῶν πάλαι καθαιρομένων ἐν αὐτῇ ἱερείων. παρ' ὁ καὶ προβατικὴ καλεῖται διὰ τὰ Θύματα."

§ "BETHESDA, piscina in Hierusalem quæ vocabatur προ-

both these ancient inhabitants of Palestine agrees, that at their early day the pool of Bethesda was *well known*, that it was *in the city*, that it was so near *the temple* as to be convenient for the washing of sacrifices, that it was then *filled with water*, and that it was (though in two sections and then without porticos) the *same structure* as the single pool which once was surrounded by covered colonnades. The Crusaders, eight hundred years later, found two immense pools near the inclosure of the temple, filled with water by rain and aqueducts from a distance.* The Greek pilgrims who visited Jerusalem afterwards,† and travellers down to our day, describe the Pool of Bethesda at the same point. Dr. Robinson, though differing with ancient and modern authorities as to the identity of this pool with the ancient Bethesda, nevertheless agrees in all that is essential to our inquiry. He regards it as the fosse, excavated for the defence of the fortress Antonia as rebuilt by Herod the Great; saying, however, “It was once evidently used as a reservoir”; and again, “That it was once filled with water is apparent from the lining of small stones and cement upon its sides”; and yet again, “The reservoir has now been dry for more than two centuries.”‡ Here, then, was an expanse of water, in an open pool *existing before Christ's day, cov-*

βατική, et a nobis interpretari potest pecualis: hæc quinque quondam porticus habuit, ostendunturque gemini lacus, quorum unus hybernis pluviosis adimpleri solet, alter mirum in modum rubens, quasi cruentis aquis antiqui in se operis signa testatur. Nam hostias in eo lavari a sacerdotibus solitas ferrunt, unde et nomen accepit.”

* See Robinson's Researches, Vol. I. p 479, Note 3.

† Among others the celebrated Phocas, and the anonymous writer “De Locis Hierosolymitanis.”

‡ Researches, Vol. I. pp. 429 – 432, 434, 490.

ering more than an acre of ground. Just such a body of water was needed for the purposes of bathing by the thousands of Jews who of old came up to Jerusalem, bringing their oxen and sheep for sacrifice ; and whether they entered by the eastern, northern, or western gates, this immense reservoir was on their road as a convenient and needed place to perform the washings demanded by the Law. Accredited historians, who could no more mistake than a Sparks in recording the life of Washington, declare that the Jewish priests used to wash the sacrificial victims here, and that hence it was called the “Sheep-pool.” Here, or near this spot, was in Christ’s day a pool so large that it had *five covered colonnades* about it, under which lay “*a great multitude* of diseased persons, *free to bathe* there and having *ample room* for the bath. Here certainly has remained since Christ’s day an expanse of water furnishing nine hundred and sixty baptisteries, each six feet by ten. When, therefore, in Christ’s day, three thousand were converted at the Pentecost, and the converts had such “favor with the people” that they could continue “daily with one accord in the temple” in Christian worship, it is utterly inconceivable that they should find no facilities for Christian baptism according to the form Christ prescribed.

2. *The King’s . . . Solomon’s Pool.*

Passing now out of the eastern gate, from which the pool just described is but a stone’s throw distant, descending thence the steep declivity to the bed of the Kedron, and proceeding from the Garden of Gethsemane down the valley southward, a ten minutes’ walk brings us near the head of the rich bottom which once

formed "the King's Garden." Here, in the rocky hill-side, above which towers the wall of the temple, we descend beneath the arched roof of a natural cave, and by a flight of steps cut in the rock, to what is now called the "Fountain of the Virgin." It is probably the "King's Pool" mentioned by Nehemiah, to which Josephus gives the name of "Solomon's Pool."* At the foot of the steps we stand in a cavernous chamber "fifteen feet long by five or six wide," and "six or eight feet high," according to Dr. Robinson's measurement. From the side towards the temple, through an arched passage-way, enters a copious stream of water, which goes out on the opposite side through a passage-way large enough to stand up in. The water in the basin formed by the floor of this chamber is from one foot to three feet deep, any desired depth being in a few minutes attained by throwing a slight dam of earth and stones across the outlet; a practice which, as Dr. Robinson observed, is now resorted to by the natives.† At certain hours of the day, troops of Arab females from the opposite village of Selwan, (the ancient *Siloam* mentioned in the New Testament,) come with their water-jars on their heads, and, thronging down the steps, linger to wade about in the cool pool and to bathe their feet and faces.‡ At other times it is so retired, that Dr. Robinson was able to change his raiment, and, wearing only a pair of Arab drawers, to spend a considerable time in examining the outlet to the pool of Siloam.§ If Providence had designed this place ex-

* Neh. ii. 14; and Josephus, Wars, V. 4. 2.

† Robinson's Researches, Vol. I. pp. 500, 502.

‡ Luke xiii. 4. See Spencer's East, (published at New York, 1850,) p. 311.

§ Robinson's Researches, Vol. I. p. 502.

pressly for immersion, there could hardly have been prepared a more convenient and appropriate font ; furnishing as it does ample room, an abundant supply of water, and also (if needed) retirement even for change of raiment.

3. *The Pool of Siloam, with its smaller Reservoir.*

Proceeding now still down the valley about a quarter of a mile farther southward, we come to that spot so full of sacred interest, the “Pool of Siloam.” It is an open reservoir, built into an excavation in the hill-side, and lined with hard cement. It is fifty-three feet long, eighteen broad, and nineteen deep. The wall next the valley is now so broken down, that not more than two or three feet of water stands in the bottom. The water enters from an arched passage-way high up on the side next the hill. Mounting the hill back of the Pool, we find a smaller reservoir, six or eight feet broad and eight or ten feet long, having a descent by steps to its bottom.* Into this smaller basin the water comes from the Pool of the Virgin just described ; and doubtless the original supply is from the gushing source under the temple area and the aqueducts centring there. In either the lower pool or the upper basin, any depth of water may be readily obtained by damming temporarily the mouth of the outlet ; a practice now resorted to, as Dr. Robinson has remarked.† It is evidently the fountain and the reservoir mentioned before the Babylonish captivity by Isaiah, after that captivity by Nehemiah, and in the day of our Saviour by John the Evangelist.‡ As to

* Robinson’s Researches, Vol. I. p. 497.

† Researches, Vol. I. p. 497.

‡ Isaiah viii. 6 ; Nehemiah iii. 15 ; John ix. 7, 11.

the permanence and abundance of the supply of water here furnished, the amplest evidence may be presented. Josephus, describing it as it was in the days of the Apostles, says of “*Siloam*”: “That is the name of a fountain which hath sweet water in it, and that in great plenty”; and again, representing to his besieged countrymen the hopelessness of their holding out against the Romans, and exhorting them to surrender their city to Titus, he remarks, “You know that Siloam, as well as the other springs without the city, . . . now have such a great quantity for your enemies, as is sufficient not only for drink both for themselves and their cattle, but also for watering their gardens.”* The old Bourdeaux Pilgrim, who visited Palestine before Constantine’s day, after describing some things *within* the city, adds: “The pool which is called Siloam has four porticos; there is another large pool without.”† Of this pool Jerome a few years later speaks, distinguishing the fountain and the pool of Siloam.‡ An interesting description of the religious washings or batheings at this place, while the sacred structures of the Christian Emperors yet stood, is given by Antoninus the Martyr in

* Josephus, Wars, V. 4. 1, and V. 9. 4. The word for “springs” is “πηγαί,” used by the LXX. and by the New Testament writers for wells, and broad expanses of water. 1 Kings i. 9; xviii. 5; 2 Kings iii. 19, 25; Exod. xv. 27; Num. xxxiii. 9; John iv. 6; 2 Pet. ii. 7; Rev. viii. 10; xiv. 7; xvi. 4. This statement of Josephus is important as showing that in the Apostles’ day *all the fountains and pools* without the city, as well as *Siloam*, were *well supplied with water*, a fact which should be borne in mind in our subsequent survey.

† “Piscina, quæ dicitur Siloa, habet quadriporticum; et alia piscina, grandis foras.” This other pool may be Gihon.

‡ Jerome on the words, “Gion, Siloe, Natatoria Siloe, and Piscina Superior et Inferior.”

the sixth century. Speaking of the fountain of Siloam, the pious chronicler says : “ There is a circular church there, from under which rises Siloam ; an inclosure of lattice-work, in one part of which men bathe, and in the other women, before the benediction ; in which waters many things are shown, and even leprous persons are cleansed. Also before the court is a vast pool, artificially constructed, in which the people bathe constantly, though at certain hours only ; for that fountain sends forth many waters which descend through the valley of Jehoshaphat.”* The bathing here mentioned seems to be a religious act. The mind accustomed to the opinions of that age will readily distinguish between the historian’s statement of facts and the religious devotee’s allusion to signs miraculous. The abundance of water supplied for bathing, and the freedom with which it was thus used, recalls to mind Christ’s direction to the blind man, if it does not impress the scene of baptism at the Pentecost. The concurrent testimony of numerous other travellers in succeeding ages might be cited ; so that a chain of testimony from Christ’s day to our own might present the facilities which Siloam always has afforded for immersion. And when one accustomed to honor the ordinance of baptism in its primitive simplicity now stands at this sacred spot, and beholds before him the copious gushing fountain, and the broad tank and

* The translation may perhaps be improved : “ *Est ibi basilica volubilis, de sub qua surgit Siloa, clausura cancellorum, in quibus pro benedictione in uno lavantur viri, in altero vero mulieres; in quibus aquis multa ostenduntur, imo et leprosi mundantur. Et ante atrium est piscina grandis, manu hominum munita, in qua lavatur populus assidue solis certis horis; nam ille fons aquas multas irrigat quæ descendant per vallem Josaphat.*

vast pool to receive it, when he sees the freedom with which men and women, by scores, now come hither, and, damming up the broken wall and the circular outlet, bathe their persons, and wash their clothing, he wonders that any one who knows that the proper meaning of the word designating the ordinance of baptism is immersion, and who has visited this spot, could hesitate as to the facilities for that rite at Jerusalem.

4. *The Old Pool, or the Upper Pool in the Highway of the Fuller's Field.*

Having now surveyed the group of pools on the east of the city, we return to our starting-point, where on the southern brow of Zion the converts at the Pentecost were gathered, and proceeding again thence, let us visit the corresponding group of pools on the west of the city. A ten minutes' walk brings us to the "Castle of David," at the western gate. Passing through that gate, we proceed up the gentle ascent northwest a distance of half a mile. Here, in the broad valley, where is centred the drain of the northern and western hills for a mile or two around, is a vast ancient pool dug into the earth and limestone rock, and its sides are built up with masonry and lined with cement. Its dimensions according to Dr. Robinson are, length 316 feet, breadth 218 feet at one end and 200 at the other, and depth 18 feet. It is probably one of the structures of which Solomon says, "I made me pools of water"; the one which even in Isaiah's early day was called "the *old pool*," and which the same prophet also speaks of as "the *upper pool* in the highway of the *fuller's field*"; the one also by which the Assyrian army encamped in Hezekiah's day, and from which that

king brought the water down into the two pools on the west of the city.* It is, then, a pool of very great antiquity, and one at which, when in proper repair, there was a quantity of water sufficient to accommodate the city dyers, to give drink to a besieging army, and to supply two other pools below. It now receives only the drain of the winter rains from the surrounding hills; but originally it seems to have been supplied by fountains in the neighborhood, which Hezekiah concealed by covering up and conducting underground their waters.† Near the bottom, on the side towards the city, an underground passage conducts its waters thither. Jerome, in the early Christian times, mentions it, attributing its construction to Solomon.‡ The Crusaders speak of it, calling it “*Lacus Patriarchæ*,” the Lake of the Patriarch, the former part of the name probably referring to its *size*, the latter to its *antiquity*.§ An old Norman Chronicle lately found in the Royal Library of Paris, and first published in 1843, a work containing facts of great value, speaks of this pool as it existed during the occupation of the Holy City by the Franks, and represents it as still supplied with water, and used to give drink to the horses of the Crusaders’ army.|| Travellers of our day, who visit Jerusalem in April, a

* Eccles. ii. 6; Isa. vii. 3; xxii. 11; 2 Kings xviii. 17; 2 Chron. xxxii. 30.

† 2 Chron. xxxiii. 14. See Robinson’s Researches, Vol. I. p. 512, and the remarks above, p. 117, on the “Fountain of Gihon.”

‡ On the words, “*Piscina Inferior et Superior*.”

§ See Robinson’s Researches, Vol. I. p. 483, note. Some of the accounts may have been conformed at least to the tradition of St. Mamilla; yet the name seems older than the tradition, and when first mentioned appears to have no reference to it.

|| Williams’s Memoir, Appendix, No. II. Sect. 6.

month after the winter rains, find this pool dry. Dr. Robinson explains the reason thus : "The tank was now dry, but in the rainy season it *becomes full.*" Again : "It would seem to be filled in the rainy season by the waters which flow into it from the higher ground round about. Or rather, *such is its present state of disrepair* that it probably never becomes full." In farther description of it he says : "The sides are built up with hewn stones laid in cement, with steps at the corners by which to descend into it."* Here then, again, is another broad basin of water, which could hardly have been better adapted to immersion if it had been constructed for that purpose. It is retired from the city ; it is broad enough, covering more than *an acre and a half of ground*, to accommodate any supposable number of administrators ; and it has steps at the corners convenient for descent. In the days of Isaiah and Hezekiah, and again in the days of the Crusaders, it was well supplied with water, and now would be if a small sum were expended in repairing it. Nothing but the very perversity of scepticism would deny the probability, or doubt the certainty even, that in the days of Herod, the great fountain-builder, (and hence in the time of Christ,) it furnished ample facilities for the immersion of Christian converts.†

* Robinson's Researches, Vol. I. pp. 352, 484.

† The suggestion may arise to some minds, that, when the pools of Jerusalem above described were *full*, the great depth of water would render them ill fitted for immersion. This difficulty will be removed by the following considerations. The supply of *rain-water* in these pools is now exhausted (and probably always was) early in the spring. As we have seen, on the testimony of Dr. Robinson and others, the main and permanent supply of water in all these pools is from aqueducts fed by *springs*. Of course the supply, except during the win-

5. *The Pool of Hezekiah.*

Turning our steps now towards the city again, in a few moments we reach the western gate whence we went out. Entering, passing the Castle of David, and bending through the narrow streets to the left, in two or three minutes we stand looking into the “Pool of Hezekiah.” The general opinion is probably correct, that this is the work of Hezekiah, thus alluded to in the Sacred History: “He made a pool and a conduit, and brought water into the city.”* Jerome mentions this pool as the “Dragon Fountain” alluded to by Nehemiah, describing it as “at the west of the city, near Mount Calvary.”† The Crusaders, from its location evidently, called it “the Pool of the Holy Sepulchre.” This reservoir, according to Dr. Robinson, is about one hundred and forty-four feet broad and two hundred and forty feet long. The natives now call it “Birket el-Hûmmâm,” the Pool of the Bath; from the fact that a neighboring bath is supplied from it. Though hemmed around by houses, there are narrow alleys by which its sides are approached; and the people freely descend to

ter and early spring, would be a gradual one, and the depth of water could be graduated at pleasure. We have seen that this is now precisely the fact at the two pools on the east side of the city; the people keeping the water at just such a height as they desire. That the same practice was pursued in our Saviour’s day is evident; for the Pool of Bethesda was then supplied with just the amount of water sufficient for bathing. Farther on, we shall perceive that the lower pool of Gihon, the largest of all these pools, is adapted, even when full, to immersion.

* 2 Kings xx. 20.

† Jerome on the Article “Fons Draconis.” This mention of it as a *fountain* seems to confirm the idea that the upper pool and this pool were once *supplied by a fountain* called Gihon. See Robinson’s Researches, Vol. I. p. 514.

wash, and to fill their water-jars. Of this pool Dr. Robinson says : "The reservoir is supplied with water during the rainy season, by the small aqueduct or drain brought down from the Upper Pool, along the surface of the ground and under the wall at or near the Yâfâ Gate. When we last saw it, in the middle of May, it was about half full of water ; which, however, was not expected to hold out during the summer."* The Rev. George Williams, an English clergyman who had resided fourteen months at Jerusalem, and who prepared his work with the aid of the accurate survey made in 1841 by the Ordnance Corps attached to the English force which recovered Syria from the Pacha of Egypt, adds these particulars : "There is a descent by steps into it at the northwest angle, and the water which in the rainy season runs in from the rude aqueduct at the southwest corner occupies only a small part of the pool in the southeast angle."† This latter remark evidently refers to the quantity of water in the pool in the dry season of the year ; for in April it is well filled, and even to the middle of May, as Dr. Robinson mentions, is well supplied with water. His former remark shows that the bottom is *sloping*, and thus favorable for descent into the water. Here then, again, near where the Apostles stood preaching, is a pool which existed long before their day, furnishing even now an ample supply of water for bathing at the season of the ancient Pentecost, having every facility for a gradual

* Robinson's Researches, Vol. I. p. 487.

† Williams's Memoir, p. 19. The full title of his work is, "Historical and Descriptive Memoir on the Town and Environs of Jerusalem. To accompany the Ordnance Survey. By George Williams, B. D., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. London. 1849."

descent into the water, covering more than an acre of ground, so as to furnish room for scores to enter together, and still generally used for the very purpose of bathing. It is not surprising that one whose early pre-possessions were opposed to the mode of baptism indicated by the word which Christ's Apostles used to express the rite, has not mentioned the natural and inevitable conclusion to which a view of this expanse must lead ; but it would seem impossible that the mind bent on the inquiry should fail to see the facilities here offered for immersion.

6. *The Lower Pool of Gihon.*

Retracing our steps now to the western city gate, and proceeding on south still in the valley about a quarter of a mile, we come to the "Lower Pool of Gihon." It is rather a *pond* than a pool, unlike all the others about Jerusalem, being formed by two dams built across the bed of the valley ; these dams forming the *ends* of the reservoir, while its *sides* are the sloping sides of the valley. It is in fact formed like a New England mill-pond ; except that it has a dam at the *head* as well as at the *foot* of the pond. A covered passage leading from the upper pool comes in at the upper dam, and, though now dry like the upper pool, it was originally supplied, doubtless, from that pool with the rain and spring water which once filled it. The immense aqueduct from the Pools of Solomon south of Bethlehem also crosses the valley about two hundred and twenty feet above the upper end of this pool, and probably from this aqueduct a supply of water was also obtained ; for the dam at the *head* of the pool (or pond) evidently indicates that the water in the pool was once made to rise above the

ordinary level of the valley, so as to require a raised embankment to restrain its spread. The dimensions of this pool are, according to Dr. Robinson's measurement, as follows : length along the centre 592 feet ; breadth at the north end 245 feet, and at the south end 275 feet ; depth at the north end 35 feet, and at the south end 42 feet. This pool has generally been regarded as "the lower pool" mentioned by Isaiah, and is probably the work ascribed to Hezekiah by the prophet Isaiah and the two historians of the Jewish king.* Though this reservoir is now dry, in the days of the Crusaders it was well supplied with water. The Norman chronicler above alluded to calls it "le Lai Germain," the *Lake of Germain*, saying that "Germain had it made to collect the waters which descended from the mountains when it rained"; and he adds, "there the horses of the city are watered."† Another Latin chronicler of the same age (A. D. 1177) calls the reservoir, in like manner, "Lacus Germani," and says that it "is common for the use of the whole city."‡ The reservoir is now called "Birket es Sultân,"— the *Sultan's Pool*; this designation probably denoting (as usual) *superiority*, either in size or excellence. Of its present condition and of its former supply of water, Dr. Robinson says: "A road crosses on the causeway at the southern end; along which are

* Isa. xxii. 9; 2 Kings xx. 20; 2 Chron. xxxii. 30.

† The chronicler probably means simply that this Germanus *repaired* the reservoir; for William of Tyre, an earlier writer, mentions this same pool as celebrated in the times of the kings of Judah, and the continuator of William of Tyre mentions that this same Germanus, who was burgess of the city under Baldwin the Fourth, opened in a time of famine the well of Job which had been filled up. See Williams's Memoir, pp. 55 and 63, and Appendix, No. II. Sect. 6.

‡ See Williams's Memoir, Appendix, No. II. Sect. 6.

fountains erected by the Muslims, and *once fed from the aqueduct which passes very near*. They were now dry. . . . This reservoir was probably *supplied from the rains, and from the superfluous waters of the Upper Pool*. It lies directly in the natural channel by which the latter would flow off, but is now in ruins.”*

Here then, again, is an immense reservoir acknowledged by all to have existed long before the days of Christ and of his Apostles. So late as the days of the Crusaders, it was so abundantly supplied with water that all the city were allowed to use it freely, and it was the great watering-place for horses. From the rains, the aqueduct, and the Upper Pool, an ample supply of water could have been obtained to keep it full when those structures were in their perfection. The pool, of course, was made of its ample dimensions with the intention that it should be filled, and it is a presumption which no ingenuous mind would think of disputing, that it was, in its original perfection, kept filled. The days of the Apostles were just subsequent to the time of Herod, who repaired with the greatest care the reservoirs at Jerusalem and throughout Palestine, and no foreign invasion had between his day and that of the Apostles occurred to break up or impair those structures. There is, therefore, an historic certainty, that when the Spirit of God was poured out at Jerusalem, after Christ’s ascension, there was in this single reservoir, covering as it does more than *four acres of ground*, and its sides having a slope just adapted to a descent for immersion,—there was, in this single reservoir, ample room for all the seventy, and for the twelve added, to act as administra-

* Robinson’s Researches, Vol. I. pp. 485, 486.

tors of the sacred rite. If, then, as the learned lexicographer seems to admit, the only ground for doubting that the rite practised by the Apostles was immersion is the want of facilities at Jerusalem in their age for that observance, the sincere inquirer needs no longer to stumble at that imaginary difficulty. For not the imaginings, nor even the personal investigations, of a fallible individual, have here been stated. On the other hand, the plain declarations of ancient, unprejudiced visitors, and the equally honest statements of those moderns who make the objection, have been brought together, and have been found to present a uniform picture by one who on the sacred soil has sought to compare and harmonize their views, and *from them to educe the truth* as it is in the Word of God. And if now, after our survey, you are in wonder that two minds, with all these same acknowledged facts before them, should come to conclusions so diverse, let me ask that you read again the first paragraph of this letter, and bear in mind that no man needs to exercise greater candor and charity than he who follows over the footsteps of eminent but interested travellers.

Other Places : Bethabara and Enon.

There are two or three other localities in *Palestine*, where the rite of baptism is said to have been administered in the days of Christ and of his Apostles, which demand a brief notice. There are, first, the two spots at which John the Baptist administered the rite ; namely, Bethabara and Enon. The precise location of neither of these places can now be fixed ; yet the slight indefiniteness as to their exact situation does not at all impair our decision of the main question. Three of the Evan-

gelists record that John baptized "*in the Jordan*"; conveying the impression that *in this stream alone* was the rite performed. The Evangelist John mentions two particular localities where John baptized; both of which there is the strongest reason for believing were *on the Jordan*, so that the four Evangelists harmonize in their statements. Now the River Jordan (as in our day is well known) is a stream supplying throughout its whole length peculiar facilities for immersion. Near ancient Jericho it was a stream of such size, that by a special miracle God divided its waters for the passage of Israel under Joshua, and afterwards of Elijah and Elisha. Only at particular places could it in ancient times be forded, while at other points it must be crossed in a boat.* Above ancient Succoth and Sichem, we learn that in Jacob's age a river called Jabbok, so large that it must be passed at a ford, joined its waters to the Jordan; so that the united stream must have been throughout the greater part of its length of no small size.† What the Jordan was in that early day, it was in Christ's age, and has been ever since. The thorough exploration by Lieutenant Lynch, in the spring of 1848, has established its varying breadth at from seventy-five to one hundred and fifty feet, and its depth (increasing of course ordinarily as the breadth diminishes) from three to twelve feet.‡ The facilities for immersion,

* Josh. ii. 7; Judg. iii. 28; 2 Sam. xix. 18.

† Gen. xxxii. 22; Deut. iii. 16. The Yermâk, which enters the Jordan several miles north of Bethshean, is "40 yards wide," and "as wide and as deep nearly as the Jordan," and is "crossed by a bridge." See Lynch's Expedition, pp. 191, 194, 196.

‡ Lieut. Lynch gives the *average* breadth and depth of the Jordan on the 1st, 2d, 4th, 5th, and 6th days of his descent. On the 8th and 9th there are separate notes; but on

therefore, are, and always have been, sufficiently ample in any portion of the stream.

The point on the river, near Bethabara, at which John first baptized, is fixed by an unbroken and unvarying tradition. As early as one hundred and fifty years after Christ's day, the place was known; just as Americans know, and always will know, the spot on the banks of James River where the first colony settled, the place on the Delaware where Washington crossed, and the point on the St. Lawrence where Wolfe landed, fought, and fell. Such a spot could no more be forgotten than can Bunker Hill. Less than two hundred years after Christ was baptized, Origen, coming from Alexandria to visit, as travellers now do, the Holy Land, found the site then fixed by a permanent tradition. Alluding to the fact that, in some of the manuscripts of his day, the name of this place was Bethabara, and in others Bethany, (a difference arising perhaps from the frequent occurrence that a place *changed* its name, or that the same place had *two names*,) Origen says: "We were persuaded that we ought not to read *Bethany*, but *Bethabara*, *having been*

the 3d and 7th there are none. The following are the details given:—

	Breadth.	Depth.	pp.
1st day	25 to 30 yds.		175
2d "	40 "	2½ to 6 ft.	184
3d "	(rapids) 40 "	(as the Yermák)	191, 194
4th "	45 "	4 ft.	203
5th "	30 to 70 "	2 to 10 ft.	221
6th "	56 "	4 ft.	238
7th "	(a short Sabbath's journey.)		
8th "	40 yds.	7 ft.	252
9th "	40 "	12 ft.	266
" "	50 "	11 ft.	267
" "	180 "	3 ft.	268

in the region tracing the history of the footsteps of Jesus, and of his disciples and of the prophets." He adds : " There is shown, they say, on the bank of the Jordan, the Bethabara where they relate that John baptized." * The Latin pilgrim of A. D. 333 records the following : " *Thence [from the Dead Sea] to the Jordan where John baptized* is five miles. There is the place above the river, a little mount on the farther bank, where Elijah was taken up to Heaven." † In his day the place was known, its distance being particularly noted ; and it was regarded as the same as that over which Elijah passed. The latter fact perhaps explains Origen's allusion to " the prophets " in the same connection. Eusebius has the following note : " Bethabara, where John was baptizing beyond the Jordan. And the place is shown ; in which also many of the brethren, even to the present time, are anxious to receive the redemption." ‡ Jerome's note is much the same : " Beth-

* The entire passage, which occurs in Origen's Commentary on John i. 28, is as follows : —

"Οτι μὲν σχεδὸν ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις κεῖται· ταῦτα ἐν Βηθανίᾳ ἔγενετο, οὐκ ἀγνοοῦμεν, καὶ ἔοικε τοῦτο καὶ ἔτι πρότερον γεγονέναι· καὶ παρὰ Ἡρακλέων γοῦν Βηθανίαν ἀνέγνωμεν· ἐπεισθημεν δὲ μὴ δεῖν Βηθανίᾳ ἀναγινώσκειν ἀλλὰ Βηθαβαρᾶ, γενόμενοι ἐν τοῖς τόποις ἐπὶ ίστορίαν τῶν ἵχνῶν Ἰησοῦ, καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῶν προφητῶν. Βηθανίᾳ γὰρ, ὡς αὐτὸς ὁ εὐαγγελιστής φησι, ἡ πατρὶς Λαζάρου καὶ Μάρθας καὶ Μαρίας, ἀπέχει τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων σταδίους πέντε καὶ δέκα ἡς πόρρω Ἰορδάνης ποταμὸς, ὡς ἀπὸ σταδίων πλατεῖ λόγῳ ἑκατόν καὶ ὅγδοικοντα ἀλλ' ουδὲ ὅμωνυμος τῇ Βηθανίᾳ τόπος ἔστι περὶ τὴν Ἰορδάνην· δείκνυσθαι δὲ λέγουσιν παρὰ τῇ ὁχθῇ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου τὰ Βηθαβαρᾶ, ἔνθα ίστοροῦσι τὸν Ἰωάννην βεβαπτικέναι."

† " Inde ad Jordanem ubi Dominus a Joanne baptizatus est millia V. Ibi est *locus super flumen* monticulus in illâ ripâ, ubi raptus est Helias in cælum."

‡ " Βηθαβαρᾶ, ὅπου ἦν Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου· καὶ δείκνυται ὁ τόπος, ἐν φᾶ καὶ πλείους τῶν ἀδελφῶν, εἰς ἔτι νῦν τὸ λυτρὸν φιλοτιμοῦνται λαμβάνειν."

abara, beyond Jordan, where John baptized unto penitence. Whence also even till this day very many of the brethren, that is, of the number of those believing, desiring there to be born again, are baptized in the life-giving flood." * In his beautiful letter in memory of Paula, a devout Roman female who had made a pilgrimage through the Holy Land, Jerome has this eloquent passage, suggesting other historical traditions as to this locality : " Scarcely had night passed when with most fervent ardor she came to the Jordan. She stood on the bank of the stream, and, as the sun rose, she remembered the Sun of righteousness ; how in the midst of the bed of the river the priests planted their dry footsteps, and at the word of Elijah and of Elisha, the waters standing on either side, an open passage offered itself ; and how the Lord by his baptism cleansed the waters polluted with mud and stained with the slaughter of the whole human race." † The Scotch Abbot Adamnanus, who entertained the shipwrecked French bishop in King Alfred's day, about A. D. 698, gathered from the pilgrim's lips these particulars, as the venerable Bede has transcribed them : " In the place in which the Lord was baptized there stands a wooden cross as high as the neck, which sometimes is hidden by the water rising

* " BETBAARA, trans Jordanem ubi Joannes in pœnitentiam baptizabat; unde et usque hodie plurimi de fratribus, hoc est de numero credentium, ibi renasci cupientes vitali gurgite baptizantur."

† " Vix nox transierat, ferventissimo æstu venit in Jordarem. Stetit in ripa fluminis, et orta sole, solis justitiæ recordata est; quomodo in medio amnis alveo sicca sacerdotes posuerint vestigia; et ad Eliæ et Elisæ imperium, stantibus ex utraque parte aquis, iter nuda præbuerit, pollutasque diluvio aquas, et totius humani generis intersectione maculatas, suo Dominus mundaverit baptismate."

above it ; from which place the farther bank, that is, the eastern, is a sling's throw distant ; while the hither bank bears on the summit of a little hill a large monastery renowned as a Church of Saint John the Baptist ; from which over a bridge supported by arches they are accustomed to descend to that cross and to pray.”*

The river, then, seven hundred years after Christ's day, at the point of his baptism, must have been several rods wide, and it is indicated that the depth east of the cross was over a man's head. Chateaubriand, the modern French tourist, mentions that the river at the same spot is “ six or seven feet in depth under the bank, and nearly fifty paces (or one hundred and seventy-five feet) in breadth.”† Dr. Robinson, though he spent a day or two in the valley, did not make any estimate ; but, quoting from a certain English traveller of 1815, named Turner, he gives the rough guess, “ rather more than fifty feet wide and five feet deep.”‡ Lieut. Lynch gives the general dimensions of the river in that region as “ forty yards wide and twelve feet deep.”

In farther description of his own impressions at the

* “ In loco, in quo Dominus baptizatus est, crux lignea stat usque al collum alta, quæ aliquotiens aqua transcendentē absconditur : a quo loco ripa ulterior, id est Orientalis, in iactu fundæ est, citerior vero ripa in supercilio monticuli grande Monasterium gestat B. Johannis Baptiste Ecclesiæ clarum : de quo per pontem arcubus suffultum solent descendere ad illam crucem, et orare.”

† “ Six à sept pieds de profondeur sous la rive, et a peu près cinquante pas de largeur.”

‡ Robinson's Researches, Vol. II. p. 261. The opposing tradition alluded to here and at p. 257, though mentioned by English travellers of the last half-century, has no authority, or even mention, among the earlier writers ; it was evidently the result of a temporary spirit of controversy between the Greek and Roman Church, and is now seldom heard of or mentioned.

spot, Lieut. Lynch records: "9½ o'clock, P. M. We arrived at 'El Meshra,' the bathing-place of the Christian pilgrims. . . . This ford is consecrated by tradition as the place where the Israelites passed over with the ark of the covenant, and where our blessed Saviour was baptized by John. Feeling that it would be desecration to moor the boats at a place so saered, we passed it, and with some difficulty found a landing below. My first act was to bathe in the consecrated stream; thanking God, first, for the precious favor of being permitted to visit such a spot, and secondly for his protecting care throughout our perilous passage. For a long time after, I sat upon the bank, my mind oppressed with awe, as I mused upon the great and wondrous events which had here occurred.

. . . Tradition, sustained by the geographical features of the country, makes this the scene of the baptism of the Redeemer. . . . On that wondrous day, when the Deity veiled in flesh descended the bank, all nature, hushed in awe, looked on,— and the impetuous river, in grateful homage, must have stayed its course and gently laved the body of its Lord. . . . Over against this was no doubt the Bethabara of the New Testament. . . . The interpretation of Bethabara is 'a place of passage over.' Our Lord repaired to Bethabara where John was baptizing; and as the ford probably derived its name from the passage of the Israelites with the ark of the covenant, the inference is not unreasonable that this spot has been doubly hallowed." Speaking of the caravan of pilgrims, who came on the annual bathing-day, the very morning the American party were encamped there, Lieut. Lynch says: "The pilgrims descended to the river where the

bank gradually slopes. Above and below, it is precipitous. The banks must have been always high in places, and the water deep. . . . Each one plunged himself, or was dipped by another, three times below the surface, in honor of the Trinity.”*

Lieut. Lynch is not alone among intelligent Americans who thus feel and act at this sacred spot; for the American mind, cultured remote from the realm of superstitious tradition and of irrational scepticism also, has learned to “distinguish things that differ.” The Rev. Mr. Spencer, of the Episcopal Church in New York, thus records his experience at this hallowed place: “Alone in a woody and retired spot, protected by the shade of the sycamore, the ilex, and the willow, I disrobed and advanced into the river. The bank is very declivitous, and in a few moments I was nearly out of my depth . . . From the depth of my soul I blessed God for the privileges of his covenant sealed to us by the holy sacrament of baptism; and I seemed to myself to be looking on the solemn and touching scene of our Lord’s baptism by his messenger whom he sent to prepare the way before him. Earnestly did I supplicate that God of his mercy would wash and purify my soul, body, and spirit, by the blood of Christ Jesus our Lord; and with the deepest reverence, remembering whom I was worshipping, I bowed my head beneath the waters of the Jordan three times, and pronounced each time the name of the FATHER, the SON, and the HOLY GHOST, the TRIUNE GOD of our salvation.” †

The most impressive season for a visit to this hallowed spot on the Jordan is during Easter week, in the

* Lynch’s Expedition, pp. 255–263.

† “The East,” by the Rev. J. A. Spencer, p. 392. New York, 1850.

middle of April, when a mighty throng of from three to five thousand persons goes pouring out of the eastern and northern gates of Jerusalem for the annual bath. There are young and old, rich and poor, men and women, mounted on horses, camels, and donkeys, or plodding on foot. They are members chiefly of the various branches of the Eastern Church, Greeks, Armenians, Syrians, and Copts, only here and there a Roman Catholic and a European traveller being seen. They all retain, from the days of their fathers and of the Apostles, the primitive ordinance of *immersion*, and though they have in infancy received from others the rite, they regard it almost indispensable to salvation that once in their lives they be immersed, on profession of their own faith, in the very spot where Jesus was baptized. Hence that immense multitude is every succeeding year an entirely *new* one ; pilgrims gathered from Russia to Egypt, and from Greece to India. A Turkish guard of four hundred men, with the governor of Jerusalem at their head, goes to guard the host from intestine strifes, and from attacks of the desert Arabs. The slow march of so vast a throng through the various defiles leading to the valley of the Jordan occupies the first day. The night encampment is near ancient Jericho, four or five miles from the sea. At midnight the whole camp is roused, and, a hasty breakfast being partaken, the traveller mounts into his saddle, and by one o'clock all are moving towards the sacred stream at the thrice sacred spot where Israel crossed, where Elijah passed, and where John baptized the Son of God. So tediously slow is the movement of the motley throng in the dark, that the gray dawn is streaming along the eastern mountain peaks ere the river is in

sight. Then, with a headlong rush, all hasten to plunge in the turbid waters ; laying aside on the banks their upper garments, wading out to their middle in the stream, and then plunging themselves forwards three times beneath the waters. In the sacred rite, strong youths support persons tottering and trembling with age, and parents plunge their little children, while vigorous men swim off beyond their depth, breasting the rapid current and again and again bowing their heads beneath the reverend tide. The Christian scholar, as he stands and gazes on the impressive scene, learns that important distinction made by the Apostles of Christ between traditions which are history and traditions which are superstition ;* separating the true from the false, clipping the text of history from the added gloss of bigotry ; sifting the kernel of the permanent and valuable from the mere chaff of the temporary and worthless. Historical traditions, as to objects of sight and of permanent existence, are as sure and as valuable in the land of our Saviour as in the land of Sesostris, of Alexander, of Cæsar, of Charlemagne, of Alfred, or of Washington. The primitive mode of baptism, the spot where our Lord received it, the identity of that spot with scenes in the lives of patriarchs and prophets,—these are objects of *sight*, matters of historical fact, and the tradition in reference to them, like all other permanent historical traditions, is the surest of all

* Compare Stephen's reference to Moses's learning, Paul's allusion to Jacob's leaning on his staff, and to Jannes and Jambres, and Jude's mention of Michael, Balaam, and Enoch, &c., where *historical traditions* are confirmed as *true*, with Christ's statement as to the *religious* "traditions of the elders," Mark vii. 3-13; Acts vii. 20-22; 2 Tim. iii. 8; Heb. xi. 21; Jude ix. 15.

testimony and the most worthy of credit. It is testimony, in fact, of such a kind, that to reject it would be to leave the whole past without any basis of certainty. There can be no question that John selected as the scene of his preaching and baptism the point on the Jordan where the great route of travel from Jerusalem and Jericho to the important cities beyond the river crossed ; a spot most favorable to gather hearers, and at the same time furnishing facilities for immersion. In that age the spot bore a name so general in signification, and so changeable in form, that before Origen's day it began to be supplanted by another of similar import ; * and afterwards, for the same reason, this second name also disappeared. The only important fact, the *locality of our Lord's baptism*, is known long after its transitory name has passed away ; just as the spot where the Pilgrims landed will a thousand years hence be certainly fixed, although even now only the antiquary knows that its original name was Pawtuxet.

Enon.

The second locality where John baptized, called *Enon*, cannot with so much precision be ascertained. Yet the following facts can be established : it was situated *on the Jordan* ; it was eight Roman or about seven and one third English miles south of ancient Bethshean or Scythopolis ; and it was at or near the great thoroughfare from Galilee and Samaria across the Jordan to the important cities on the other side. That it was *on the*

* The signification usually assigned to *Bethabara* is "house or place of the ford or passage," and that of *Bethany* (the name Origen rejected) is "house or place of ships," the two being equivalent. See Robinson's N. Test. Greek Lexicon.

Jordan is implied in the fact, that no one of the New Testament writers mentions any other water than the Jordan in which John baptized. Eusebius and Jerome describe the location as well known in their early day; implying that, for the three hundred previous years since Christ's day, the place had always been marked. The former makes this record: “Ænon, near to Alim, where John baptized, as in the Gospel according to John. And even to the present time the place is shown, eight miles from Scythopolis, towards the south, near to Salim and the Jordan.”* The latter records: “Ænon, near Salim, where John baptized, as it is written in the Gospel according to John; and the place is now shown, at the eighth mile-stone from Scythopolis at the south, near Salim and the Jordan.”† The testimony of these ancient writers, who lived so near the time of Christ, and had such ample opportunities for investigation, fixes the site of Enon *on the Jordan*, and at seven and one third English miles south of ancient Scythopolis, or Bethshean, whose ruins yet remain a distinct landmark, bearing the name of Beisan. Among more modern authors, Brocardus, in the later period of the Crusades, makes this mention of it: — “Before Mount Galaad, towards Jezreel, which is on the northern side of Mount Gilboa, a level road passes from Jordan, at Salim, where John baptized. From Bethsan there are two

* “Αἰνῶν, ἐγγὺς τοῦ Ἀλεὶμ ἔνθα ἐβάπτιζεν Ἰωάννης, ὡς ἐν τῷ κατὰ Ἰωάννην εὐαγγελίῳ· καὶ δείκνυται εἰς ἦτι νῦν ὁ τόπος ἀπό οὗ σημείων Σκυθοπόλεως πρὸς νότον πλησίον Σαλεὶμ καὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου.” “Ἀλεὶμ” is evidently the same as “Σαλεὶμ” below.

† “ÆNON, juxta Salim, ubi baptizabat Joannes, sicut in Evangelio κατὰ Ἰωάννην scriptum est; et ostenditur usque nunc locus in octavo lapide Scythopoleos ad meridiem juxta Salim et Jordanem.”

Gallic miles (nearly three English) towards the west to Jezreel." A reference to Dr. Robinson's map will show that this road must have passed all along the northeastern slope of Mount Gilboa, through the plain to the river; and that it was at the point upon the Jordan where the great thoroughfare from Western Galilee and Samaria crosses it, that John selected his favorable location for baptizing. Burckhardt has the following on the general locality. Of Beisan he says: "The ancient town was watered by a river now called *Moiet Bysan* (Waters of Beisan), which flows in different branches through the plain." "The town is built along the banks of the rivulet." Having spoken of the mountain range north of Beisan, he says: "At one hour distant to the south, the mountains begin again." Burckhardt crossed the Jordan, two hours distant (about six miles) from Beisan, from which point its ruins lay north-north-west. It was the 2d of July, in midsummer, when he crossed; and at that season he found the stream "80 paces broad and 3 feet deep." He adds: "The river is fordable in many places during summer, but the few spots where it may be crossed in the rainy season are known only to the Arabs. The river, for three hours from the lake [Tiberias], flows on the west side of the valley, then on the eastern, and at two hours south of the ford returns to the western side. Near where we crossed, to the south, are ruins called *Lukkot*." Burckhardt's statement as to the waters of Beisan does not interfere with Josephus's statement, that the valley was without water except the Jordan; * since what he calls a *river* in one sentence he calls a *rivulet* in another. As he crossed evidently near the place where John

* Josephus, Wars, IV. 8. 2.

baptized, his statement as to the size of the stream is valuable. His mention of the direction of the river from Beisan, nearly due south, shows that, according to Eusebius and Jerome's statement, Enon might be *south* of Beisan and yet *on the Jordan*. We learn, also, that, at the point where John baptized, the valley ran near the eastern mountains, having on the west a plain where a habitable town would naturally stand. We see from his statement, also, that John's place of baptizing could not have been far from the thoroughfare by which Jacob and his family and flocks crossed.

Dr. Robinson thus describes Ain Jalud, "a very large fountain" near Jezreel, which is about eight miles northwest of Beisan: "It spreads out at once into a fine limpid pool forty or fifty feet in diameter, in which great numbers of small fish were sporting." In speaking of the stream which passes Beisan he says: "This would seem probably to be the rivulet which comes down from the valley of Jezreel."* While this account shows that in Palestine there are pools and other places where immersion might be practised, it of course furnishes no information as to Enon, which was eight Roman miles south of Beisan. The celebrated English travellers, Irby and Mangles, make the following statements on this locality: "At one hour and twenty minutes from Bysan, the depth of the ford reached above the bellies of the horses. We measured the breadth, and found it 140 feet. . . . About half a mile to the south is a tomb on a barrow called Sheikh Daoud."

The expedition of Lieut. Lynch, during the spring of 1848, has added some important particulars to what

* Robinson's Researches, Vol. III. pp. 167, 168, 175.

was before known as to this locality. In his account of the day previous to his passing the section of the river where Enon must have been situated, he records, that, near their encamping place (which on the map is two or three miles below Beisan), "the river describes a series of frantic curvilinears, and returns in a contrary direction to its main course." "The river averaged to-day forty-five yards in width, and four feet in depth."^{*} The land party who visited Beisan, not far from that town "came to quite a large stream," evidently the same mentioned above. The following day, during which the position of ancient Enon must have been passed, Lieut. Lynch seems to have passed the most enchanting region on the river. Of this day he says: "The river, from its eccentric course, scarcely permitted a correct sketch of its topography to be taken. It curved and twisted north, south, east, and west, turning, in the short space of half an hour, to every quarter of the compass, seeming as if desirous to prolong its luxuriant meanderings in the calm and silent valley." "Here and there were spots of solemn beauty. The numerous birds sang with a music strange and manifold. . . . Above all, yet attuned to all, was the music of the river, gushing with a sound like that of shawms and cymbals. . . . At times we issued from the shadow and silence of a narrow and verdure-tented part of the stream into an open bend, where the rapids rattled, and the light burst in, and the birds sang their wildwood song."[†] Over and over, with a spirit resem-

* Lynch's Expedition, pp. 203, 207. The location of the camp mentioned on p. 207, "E. by N. from Beisan, which was two hours distant," evidently should read "E. by S.," Beisan being "W. by N."

† Pp. 212, 213.

bling that of romance, the almost enchanted navigator repeats the varied beauties of that day's progress.

Knowing now, as we do, from the ancient Christian writers, that in the midst of this very scene stood "Enon," who can fail to see where the descriptive John obtained his expression "many waters" or "much water," for these interminable windings of the river certainly gave many a shady retreat, and a shallow, gentle flow, for the administering of immersion; and those "rattling rapids" and dashing cataracts are, in their appropriate measure, "*the voice of many waters.*" Further on, in reference to this same day's journey, Lieut. Lynch says: "In our course to-day we have passed twelve islands, all but three of diminutive size, and noted fourteen tributary streams, ten on the right [or west] and four on the left bank. With the exception of four, they were trickling rivulets." "The width of the river was as much as seventy yards, with two knots current, and narrowed again to thirty yards, with six knots current; the depth ranging from two to ten feet." "About five miles nearly due west from the camp were the ruins of Succoth." Lieut. Lynch has so much of his own impressions to record this day, that he has mentioned little or nothing of the observations of the land party, except that, on account of the mountain range running near the river, they were obliged, most of the day, to travel far to the west of the stream. This, however, they were not obliged to do, until farther south than the site of ancient Enon.

It was the happy lot of your correspondent, four days afterwards, on Tuesday, April 18th, 1848, to meet the party at the Pilgrims' Bathing-Place below, when Dr. Anderson became his companion to

Jerusalem. Particular inquiries were made as to the shape of the country, and as to other particulars. No stream or fountain was met by the party during the day on which they traversed the plain where Enon once stood. No relic of such a name seems to remain. The permanent record of the early Christians, sanctioned by the New Testament writers, and confirmed by all subsequent observations, leaves no doubt that Enon was at a passage of the Jordan in the romantic region above described, and at a point which might be accurately ascertained by any one who should measure the distance from Beisan. It was my design to visit this locality, a few days after meeting the party on the Jordan, and personally to examine it ; but on arriving within a day's journey of the region, no persuasion or offer of money could prevail on my Arab attendants to venture into the dangerous neighborhood. The replies to my inquiries, however, and my own distant scanning of the region from mountain summits, left an impression hardly less definite and satisfactory than a personal visit could have given.

The Place where Philip baptized the Eunuch.

Yet one more locality in Palestine mentioned as the scene of Christian baptism in the time of the Apostles demands notice ; namely, the place on the road from Jerusalem to Gaza where the Ethiopian eunuch was baptized by Philip. No spot in Palestine was marked with more interest and more particularity by the early Christian pilgrims and Christian scholars. The Bourdeaux Pilgrim, less than three hundred years after the event, described with care its situation. His note is (as he advances from Bethlehem) : “Thence to Bethazsora is

fourteen miles, where is the fountain in which Philip baptized the eunuch. Thence to the oak where Abraham dwelt is nine miles. Thence to Hebron is two miles.”* Eusebius, on the word *Bethsur*, has the following note: “Bethsur of the tribe of Judah or Benjamin. There is also now a village Bethsoron, twenty miles distant from Jerusalem towards Hebron, where also a fountain issuing from a mountain is shown, in which the eunuch of Candace is said to have been baptized by Philip. There is also another Bethsur in the tribe of Judah, distant one mile from the city of Eleutheropolis.”† Jerome in like manner says on the same word: “Bethsur in the tribe of Judah or Benjamin. And there is at this day a village Bethsoron, to us going from Jerusalem to Hebron, at the twentieth mile-stone; near which a fountain, boiling up at the foot of a mountain, is absorbed by the same soil from which it springs, and the Acts of the Apostles record that the eunuch of Queen Candace was baptized in this by Philip. There is another village Bethsur in the tribe of Judah a mile distant from Eleutheropolis.”‡ In his beautiful eulogy

* “Inde Bethazsora millia XIV., ubi est fons in quo Philippus Eunuchum baptizabat.” “Inde terebintho millia IX. ubi Abraham habitavit,” etc. “Inde terebintho Chebron millia II.”

† “Βεθσύρ, φυλῆς Ἰούδα ἡ Βενιαμίν· καὶ ἔστι νῦν κώμη Βηθσορῶν ἀπὸ Αἰλίας εἰς Χεβρῶν ἐν ἔικοσι σημείοις, ἐνθα καὶ πηγὴ ἀπὸ ὄρους ἔξιονσα δείκνυται, ἐν ἦ λέγεται ὁ εὐνοῦχος Κανδάκης βεβαπτίσθαι ὑπὸ Φιλίππου.” “Εστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλη Βεθσούρ φυλῆς Ἰούδα, Ἐλευθεροπόλεως (ἀπέχονσα σημείοις α').” The difference of spelling in the two names for Bethsur will be remarked.

‡ “BETHSUR, in tribu Juda, sive Benjamin, et est hodie Bethsoron vicus euntibus nobis ab Aelia Chebron in vicesimo lapide, juxta quem fons ad radices montis ebulliens ab eadem in qua gignitur sorbetur humo; et Apostolorum Acta referunt

on Paula, the Roman pilgrim, Jerome records : “ She began to pass over the ancient way which leads to Gaza, the power or the riches of God, and in silence to revolve with herself how the Ethiopian eunuch, prefiguring the people of the nations, had changed his skin ; and, while she read again the ancient document, she found again the fountain of the Gospel. And thence she passed to the right. From Bethsur she came to Escol, which is translated, *the grape-cluster*. . . . And she ascended to Hebron.”* In the days of the Crusaders the same locality was fixed. Brocardus, A. D. 1283, records : “ From Hebron it is reckoned three Gallic leagues [four and a half Roman miles] towards the north, declining a little to the west, to *Nehel-Escol*, that is, the *torrent-bed of the grape-cluster*, whence the spies bore the branch of the grape ; Num. xiii. 23, 24, 25. At the left of this valley through half a league [three quarters of a Roman mile] descends the stream in which Philip baptized the eunuch of Queen Candace, not far from Sicelech. From *Nehel-Escol* it is reckoned eight leagues [twelve Roman miles] to the house of Zachariah.”† At a later period,

Eunuchum Candacis Reginæ in hoc esse baptizatum a Philippo. Est et alia villa Bethsur in tribu Juda mille passibus distans ab Eleutheropoli.”

* “ Cœpit per viam veterem pergere, quæ ducit Gazam, ad potentiam vel ad divitias Dei ; et tacita secum voluere, quomodo Eunuchus Æthiops gentium populos præfigurans, mutaverit pellem suam ; et dum vetus relegit instrumentum, fontem reperit Evangelii. Atque inde ad dexteram transit. A Bethsur venit Escol quæ in *botrum* vertitur. Atque adscendit Chebron.”

† “ Ab Hebron tres numerantur leucæ contra aquilonem, declinando paululum ad occidentem, ad *Nehel-Escol* id est *torrentem botri*, unde exploratores portaverunt palmitem uvæ Num. xiii. 23, 24, 25. Ad lævam hujus vallis per dimidiam

(perhaps for the reason that *Bethsur* was a general name, and given to different places, perhaps also from a spirit of controversy between the Eastern and Western Christians, or for convenience,) the location of the traditionary spot was changed; as Sinai was in like manner changed to Serbal.* Hence several succeeding modern writers, as Quistorpius, Pococke, and Buckingham, describe the fountain of Philip as being in a valley, which Pococke states to be “about six miles north-northwest of Bethlehem.” Dr. Robinson doubts the authority of the early tradition; intimating the two objections, that the Itinerary of the Bourdeaux Pilgrim makes Bethsur eleven Roman miles from Hebron, whereas it is but six miles to the site he himself (doubtless correctly) has marked for Bethsur, and again, that the road from Jerusalem to Gaza could not have passed that way.† As to the first difficulty, it is doubtless explained by Jerome, who describes Paula as *turning to the right* in going from Bethsur to Escol, evidently making a *circuit* around the mountain interposed, instead of going directly over it. The Bourdeaux Pilgrim is precisely accurate in the other distances he mentions; for his six miles from Jerusalem to Bethlehem and his fourteen miles from Bethlehem to Bethsur make the twenty miles of Eusebius and Jerome; and his two miles from the oak of Abraham to Hebron agrees precisely with the *forty minutes* occupied by Dr. Robinson in passing over the same ground.‡

leucam descendit rivos, in quo Philippus baptizavit Eunuchum Candacis Reginæ, haud longe a Sicelech. A *Nehel-Escol* octo numerantur leucæ versus Jerusalem, ad domum Zachariæ.”

* Alluded to in Robinson’s Researches, Vol. I. pp. 173, 186.

† Researches, Vol. I. p. 320.

‡ Ibid., Vol. II. p. 429.

As to the second objection, Reland will reply to it. Dr. Robinson marks another locality, Tellel-Hasy (which is also on the road from Jerusalem to Gaza by way of Hebron), suggesting that there is a sufficient expanse of water for the administration, though he does not describe its size.* Many others equally favorable might be mentioned on the same road ; but the authority of Eusebius and Jerome, as to the precise locality where the rite was administered, cannot be disregarded where *baptism* is concerned, any more than where the site of an old Roman town, as Eleutheropolis, is to be determined. The best authority in Biblical geography of modern times, Reland, speaking of *Bethsur*, regards the locality mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome to be the same as that mentioned among the mountains between Jerusalem and Hebron in Joshua's time, which was afterwards fortified by Rehoboam.† He thinks it also the same as the *Bethsura* fortified by the Macca-bees, which is described as "in Idumea," and again as "on the borders of Judea" ; while he regards the mentioned distance, "five furlongs from Jerusalem," either to be a mistake, or to refer to another fortress.‡ As to the road to Gaza and the locality where the eunuch was baptized, Reland's language is : "Near this village there is a fountain boiling up at the foot of the mountain, and in which, they say, the eunuch of Queen Candace was baptized. See Eusebius in his Onomasticon and the Jerusalem Itinerary." This tradition Cellarius argues to be false, because the Ethiopian

* Researches, Vol. II. pp. 380, 641.

† Josh. xv. 58 and 2 Chron xi. 7.

‡ 1 Mac. iv. 29, 61; vi. 7, 26, 31, 49; ix. 52; xiv. 7, 33; also, 2 Mac. xi. 5, etc.

was not going in the way leading to Hebron, but in the way leading to Gaza, which declines far to the west of Hebron. But, though Gaza may lie to the west of Hebron, the roads were not always constructed straight through the shortest routes ; nor do I think that by this circumstance the authority of this tradition is diminished. I acknowledge that a route might be established from Jerusalem to Gaza, first towards the west as far as the plains of Judah, and then through the region bordering on the shore of the Mediterranean Sea to Gaza. We know also that formerly (whether as early as the time at which the eunuch lived that third route existed is uncertain) journeys were made from Jerusalem to Eleutheropolis, and thence to Ascalon, and so on to Gaza. This follows from the Itinerary of Antonine. But that through Hebron also the journey to Gaza was made, follows from the fact, that in almost all the itineraries of the moderns we read that, if any one journeyed from Jerusalem to Gaza, they went through Hebron thither ; never, so far as I know, through the plains bordering on the shore of the Mediterranean Sea.”*

With reason does Reland express the doubt whether the route by Eleutheropolis existed in the eunuch’s day ; since according to Dr. Robinson that town is not mentioned, even by its name *Betogabra*, until the beginning of the second century after Christ, nor by its later and more important name till the fourth century. On the Article “*Ælia Gazam,*” *From Jerusalem to Gaza*, Reland presents the same view again. On the word *Gaza* he expresses the opinion, that the word

* The work of Reland is so accessible as to make it unnecessary to quote the Latin.

“desert,” in Acts viii. 26, refers to the *city*, not to the *route*. It is worthy of remark, however, that the designation, coming as it does from the pen of Luke, is peculiarly applicable to the *route by Hebron*; for the *same writer* uses the *same word*, in the *same general sense*, and in describing the *same region*, when he mentions that John the Baptist was reared “in the deserts”; the home of John’s parents, according to Dr. Robinson, being at Juttah near Hebron.*

Starting now from Jerusalem on the route thus indicated, let us view the facilities for immersion along its course, and especially at the spot where history has fixed the eunuch’s baptism. Proceeding on horses, at the ordinary rate of three Roman miles an hour,† in two hours and thirty minutes we reach the three immense pools of Solomon, from which water was conducted to Jerusalem. In Christ’s day they were little lakes of water, for the three cover about three acres of ground,‡ and when filled they furnished all needed facilities for immersion, lying open, as they do, and in a retired valley. Even now, such is the quantity of water in the lower pool, that a more convenient place for the sacred ordinance could hardly be desired. Proceeding thence over hill and dale, and through one long valley, which, from the number of its wells, the muleteers call “Wady el-Bear,” the *Valley of Wells*, in one hour and fifty minutes more we stopped on a hill-side to water our horses, and to drink at a large reservoir with an arched roof, from which the water is drawn up with a bucket. Of this place Dr. Robinson says: “The road up the ascent

* See Luke i. 80.

† See Robinson’s Researches, Vol. I. p. 545.

‡ See Robinson’s Researches, Vol. II. p. 165.

is artificial ; half way up is a cistern of rain-water, and an open place of prayer for the Mohammedan travellers.”* At this spot immersion would not be difficult. Descending thence into the fine valley before us, crossing it, and ascending on the opposite side, in thirty-five minutes more we reached the ruins of an ancient town, which our muleteer calls Howoffnee, but which Dr. Robinson has marked Abu Fid ; mentioning “ olive-trees and tillage around, and a reservoir of rain-water.”† This *reservoir* lies in the open field, with a grassy brink around it. It is fifty or sixty feet square, and it is now, in the last of April, full of water, the depth being apparently from three to five feet. It is evidently ancient, the walls being built up of large hewn stones. A fitter place for immersion could not be desired. Along in front of the old town and pool, a fine old Roman road, paved with stone and having neat curbing-stones at the side, may be traced in the grass some distance down the hill-side towards Jerusalem ; as evident a carriage-road as is the old Appian Way now seen south of Rome. Proceeding onwards, through a country quite open and considerably cultivated, in one hour and five minutes we reach, at the foot of a long and steep hill, the ruins of a fortress or church on the left of our road. The structure is perhaps fifty feet front, and sixty feet long. Within there are the remains of two large halls, with an arched ceiling. The stones of the building are massive, some of them eight feet long and two feet square. There are three door-ways in front. In some respects

* Robinson’s Researches, Vol. I. p. 320. The water is evidently *spring*-water, rather than rain-water ; for it is slightly tinctured with the limestone of the hills.

† Robinson’s Researches, Vol. I. p. 320.

it resembles a fortress, in others an ancient church. On the hill-side, half a mile southwest, is another less ruined fortress. The one near us is called, by the shepherds keeping their flocks here, *Anee ed-Dirweh*, and the other, *Es-Soor ed-Dirweh*. In front of the fortress by us is a fine gushing fountain of sweet water, and broad stone troughs in which we water our horses. This spot has been fixed on by Dr. Robinson as the *Bethsur* mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome as the place where the ennuch was baptized.* Halhul, mentioned next to Bethsur in the list of towns of Joshua's age,† stands on the hill-top, a mile or more distant, still called *Hǔlhǔl* by the natives. The *distance*, which we have made six hours by horse or eighteen Roman miles from Jerusalem on the *direct* route, agrees well with the twenty miles of the *ancient* route, which *bent easterly through Bethlehem*. The ground in front of the fountain and of the structure behind it is so broken up and covered with stones, that it is difficult to determine what was once here. There is now a slightly depressed hollow, with a sandy or gravelly bottom. It is hardly conceivable that, in the days of Herod, the fountain-builder, this most favorable spring should not have been made to supply a pool in this land of such structures; and even now water sufficient to supply such a reservoir flows from the troughs and soaks into the soil; as, according to Jerome's mention, in his day it seems also to have been absorbed. That there was an

* Robinson's Researches, Vol. I. p. 320, note. Under the word *Beth-tsur*, in Robinson's edition of Gesenius's Hebrew Lexicon, the name *Beit-Sûr* is said also to be applied to *ed-Dirweh*.

† Joshua xv. 58.

ancient and even a *modern* route from Jerusalem to Gaza by *Hebron*, Reland and the ancient Christian writers have shown ; and, what is more, even now the *usual* route from Jerusalem to Gaza is by Hebron. If the traveller at Gaza, for instance, hires horses and mules to Jerusalem, the *understanding* is, that the journey is to be made by Hebron, as the smoother and safer road ; and an extra price must be paid to go by the more direct, though rougher and more dangerous route. That an ancient "*chariot*" road passed this way, the observant traveller will often perceive on his journey. Dr. Robinson, twice between Hebron and Jerusalem, notices this ; * and we have traced even plainer evidences.

The task to which you invited me is at length finished ; having swelled into a more extended labor than was at first anticipated. If the conclusions here suggested shall seem to be just, awaking in the minds of other inquirers the same confident and cheering faith they have begotten in the mind of the writer, it will be an ample requital both for the toil of the study and for the fatigues of the journey.

Yours as ever,
G. W. S.

* Researches, Vol. I. pp. 316, 320 ; "the path is here paved," &c. ; and "the road is artificial."

A
BRIEF STATEMENT
OF THE
BEST ESTABLISHED RESULTS
AT WHICH BIBLICAL INTERPRETERS HAVE ARRIVED
RESPECTING
INFANT BAPTISM.
BY HORATIO B. HACKETT, D. D.

To THE REV. DR. HACKETT.

Boston, April 1st, 1851.

REV. AND VERY DEAR SIR,—Your studies in the department of instruction which you fill at Newton have, I doubt not, made you familiar with many facts pertaining to the present state of Biblical Literature and Interpretation, that are not so generally known as they ought to be. I cherish a confidence in your readiness, not only to oblige a friend, but, what is infinitely more important, to serve Him to whom we owe all our hopes of holiness and eternal life. And this confidence encourages me to request of you, for publication, a brief statement of the best established results to which Biblical interpreters have arrived, respecting passages that have often been mentioned in discussing matters of differences between Baptists and Pedobaptists.

Most fraternally yours,

I. C.

REPLY.

Newton Theological Institution, Aug. 12th, 1851.

REV. DR. CHASE:

DEAR SIR,—I shall be gratified, if the character of the following communication should be such as to answer the purpose contemplated in your note. I have

confined myself to a few authorities, because it seemed better to refer only to the more recent writers, and to those who have made the Bible their particular field of study.

May your voice long be heard pleading for a full recognition of the principle, that the Scriptures constitute our "only and sufficient rule of faith and practice." May the Head of the Church continue to bless your efforts for building up his cause, and for promoting the spiritual welfare of men.

Yours, with Christian esteem,

H. B. HACKETT.

RESULTS OF THE LATEST CRITICISM IN REGARD TO INFANT BAPTISM.

THE passages in the New Testament, which have been mainly relied on as proving the existence of infant baptism in the time of the Apostles, are Acts xvi. 15, xviii. 8, and 1 Cor. i. 16. No decision in Biblical criticism, not absolutely unanimous, can be considered as better established at the present time, than that of the utter insufficiency of these passages to prove, or to justify the practice referred to, as an Apostolic institution. The following testimonies of men, who are admitted to possess the highest authority in regard to inquiries of this nature, may be taken as representing the attitude in which this subject now stands, as viewed in the light which the present state of Biblical learning has shed upon it. It gives weight to these testimonies, that they proceed from men whose ecclesiastical position would naturally dispose them to adopt a different view ; who belong to a church that practises infant baptism, and who, for the most part, contend that it is proper to adhere to it, notwithstanding their acknowledgment that the usage has no Scriptural warrant.

MEYER (H. A. W.), in his Commentary on the Acts, remarks on xvi. 15 as follows : — “ Appeal is made to

this passage, to xviii. 8 and 1 Cor. i. 16, in order to prove the custom of infant baptism in the Apostolic age, or, at least, to show its probability ; but without reason. For *that the baptism of children was not in use at that time* appears evidently from 1 Cor. vii. 14, where Paul could not have written, ‘ Else were your children unclean (*ἀκάθαρτα*), but now are they holy (*ἅγια*)’, if the children had been ecclesiastically holy by virtue of their baptism.* Hence, if there were children in the families mentioned in the above passages, who were incapable of attaining to a perception of faith by means of instruction, (which it is very precarious at least to deny, i. e. that such children belonged to these families,) we must decide that they were excluded from the baptism which the other members of the household received. The readers understood that exclusion as a matter of course, since they knew the custom was not to baptize little children.

“ In addition to this historical and exegetical proof of the non-existence of infant baptism in the Apostolic Church, the following confirmatory arguments deserve to be considered. 1. Nowhere in the New Testament is the baptism of a child expressly mentioned, which, since the cases must have occurred very often, would be very surprising. 2. A baptism without instruction and faith is without example in the case of any person, and conflicts with Matt. xxviii. 19. 3. The early and long-continued opposition to infant baptism would be inexplicable, had it been accounted as beyond doubt an

* For, according to this view, the Apostle could not have reasoned from the case of baptized children to that of the unbelieving, and consequently unbaptized, husband or wife, connected with a believing wife or husband.

Apostolic institution. 4. Paul in particular, with his fundamental view of justification by faith, which led him to take such decided ground against the supposed merit of circumcision, would hardly have promoted and allowed a usage, which could so easily have been urged as analogous to the Jewish idea of circumcision ; at least, passages would not be wanting in his Epistles, in which infant baptism would be compared with circumcision, and his readers guarded against such misapprehension. . . . The baptism of children arose from the idea of the necessity of baptism to salvation."

OLSHAUSEN, in his well-known commentary, remarks as follows on the same passage : "On this account also," (viz. that a confession of faith preceded baptism,) "it is in the highest degree improbable that by 'her household' (*oīkos aὐτῆς*) we are to understand children not yet arrived at years of discretion ; relatives, servants, grown-up children, were baptized with her. We have not, in fact, a single sure proof-text for the existence of infant baptism in the time of the Apostles, and the *necessity* of it cannot be derived from the idea of baptism." He says on 1 Cor. i. 17, that "nothing can be inferred in favor of infant baptism from the word 'household' (*oīkos*), because the adult members of the household (comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 15), or the servants in it, may alone be meant." He considers the interpretation of 1 Cor. vii. 14, as founded on the necessary supposition, that the baptism of children was then unknown. "Paul could not have chosen the mode of proof adopted there, had the custom prevailed at that time."

DE WETTE's comment on Acts xvi. 15 is this : "Here, as well as in ver. 33, xviii. 8, and 1 Cor. i. 16, some would find a proof of the Apostolic baptism of children ; but

there is nothing in the passage which shows that any except adults were baptized." According to his view of the meaning of 1 Cor. vii. 14, it is impossible that baptism should have been applied to children in the primitive churches. In arguing from the case of children to that of married persons, one of whom is an unbeliever, in order to justify the continuance of the relation, "the Apostle must appeal to something which lay out of the disputed case, but which had a certain similarity and admitted of an application to it. This something is nothing else than the relation which the children of Christian parents in general sustain to the Christian Church, and the expression 'your children' refers to all the Corinthian Christians. The children of Christians were not yet received properly into a Christian community, *were not yet baptized*, and did not take part in the devotional exercises and love-feasts of the Church; accordingly, they might have been regarded as unclean (*ἀκάθαρτα*), with as much reason as the unbelieving consort could be so regarded. . . . In this passage, therefore, we have a proof that children had not begun to be baptized in the time of the Apostles."*

NEANDER is best known among us as an eminent ecclesiastical historian; but he was accustomed, from the beginning of his career as a teacher, to lecture also on the New Testament, and his merits as a Biblical scholar are hardly less decided, or in his own country less gen-

* These sentences are from De Wette's Article in the Theological Studies and Criticisms, p. 669, 1830. He maintains that the passage justifies the *present* practice of infant baptism, while it proves beyond doubt that it was unknown to the Apostles.

erally acknowledged, than his merits as an historian. His opinion on this subject appears in the following extract from his Planting and Training of the Christian Church by the Apostles.* “ Since baptism marked the entrance into communion with Christ, it resulted from the nature of the rite, that a confession of faith in Jesus as the Redeemer would be made by the person to be baptized. As baptism was closely united with a conscious entrance on Christian communion, faith and baptism were always connected with one another; and thus it is in the highest degree probable that baptism was performed only in instances where both could meet together, and that the practice of infant baptism was unknown at this period. We cannot infer the existence of infant baptism from the instance of the baptism of whole families; for the passage in 1 Cor. xvi. 15 shows the fallacy of such a conclusion, as from that it appears that the whole family of Stephanas, who were baptized by Paul, consisted of adults. That not till so late a period as (at least certainly not earlier than) Irenæus a trace of infant baptism appears, and that it first became recognized as an Apostolic tradition in the course of the third century, is evidence rather *against* than *for* the admission of its Apostolic origin; especially since in the spirit of the age when Christianity appeared there were many elements which must have been favorable in its introduction, the same elements from which proceeded the notion of the magical effects of outward baptism, the notion of its absolute necessity for salvation. How very much must infant baptism have corresponded with such a tendency, if it had been

* Quoted chiefly in the language of Mr. Ryland's translation.

favored by tradition ! It might indeed be alleged, on the other hand, that, after infant baptism had long been recognized as an Apostolic institution, various other causes hindered its more general introduction, and so the same causes might still earlier stand in the way of its spread, although it was a practice sanctioned by the Apostles. But these causes could not have acted in this manner in the age succeeding that of the Apostles. Besides, it is one thing that a practice, which could not altogether deny the marks of its later institution, although at last recognized as of Apostolic founding, could not for a length of time pervade the life of the Church ; and it is another thing that a practice really proceeding from Apostolic institution and tradition, notwithstanding the authority which introduced it, and the points of contact which it found in a prevailing tendency of the times, should not have obtained universal adoption.

“And from whom — let us think distinctly of the process — could the institution of infant baptism have proceeded ? Certainly, not directly from Christ himself. Was it from the primitive Church in Palestine, from an injunction given by the earlier Apostles ? But among the Jewish Christians circumcision was held as a seal of the covenant, and hence they had so much less occasion to make use of another dedication for their children. Could it then have been Paul that first introduced among heathen Christians this change in the use of baptism ? But this would agree least of all with the peculiar Christian characteristics of this Apostle. He who says of himself that Christ sent him, not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel ; he who always kept his eye fixed on one thing, justification by faith, and so care-

fully avoided every thing which could give a handle or a support to the notion of a justification by outward things (*σαρκικά*),— how could he have set up infant baptism against the circumcision that continued to be practised by the Jewish Christians ? In this case, the dispute carried on with the Judaizing party, on the necessity of circumcision, would easily have given an opportunity of introducing this substitute into the controversy, if it had really existed. The evidence arising from silence on this topic has, therefore, the greater weight."

RÜCKERT states the argument in 1 Cor. vii. 14 thus : " If so intimate a connection as that between the husband and the wife should not sanctify the unbelieving party, then must also your children, whose entire relation to the Church rests only upon their Christian parentage, likewise be unclean ; for they are as far from being sanctified by baptism as the others. But now you yourselves are of the firm belief that your children are holy, simply from the fact that they are your children, and in that belief you are correct ; therefore, the mere connection with a Christian must be sufficient to sanctify also the other party. It is plain that De Wette and Neander have with reason regarded the passage as proof that the baptism of children did not exist in the time of Paul."

[No additional evidence is necessary in order to prove that the eminent writers mentioned in the preceding sketch agree in this ; namely, The connection in which the children are called *holy*, in 1 Cor. vii. 14, is such as shows that they were not baptized.

It ought to be remarked that Neander, and most, if not all, of the others, represent that we find in this passage

"a trace that already the children of Christians were distinguished from the children of heathens, and might be considered in a certain sense as belonging to the Church." "The Apostle," he says, "is here treating of the sanctifying influence of the communion between parents and children, by which the children of Christian parents would be distinguished from the children of those who were not Christian, and in virtue of which they might in a certain sense be termed *holy* in contrast with the *unclean*. . . . In the point of view here chosen by Paul, *we find* (although it testifies against the existence of infant baptism) *the fundamental idea from which infant baptism was afterwards necessarily developed*, and by which it may be justified to agree with Paul's sentiments; an indication of the preëminence belonging to children born in a Christian community; the consecration for the kingdom of God, which is thereby granted to them, an immediate sanctifying influence which would communicate itself to their earliest development."

But what the Apostle Paul must have thought of infant baptism, had it been proposed in his day, has, in a previous extract, been sufficiently shown by the lamented author whose words have just now been quoted. On that point, therefore, nothing needs to be added.

Birth in a Christian community does, indeed, give our children a preëminence above the condition of children in a heathen community. But how can it involve the propriety of their being baptized before they become believers in Christ?

'The true Christian *consecrates* himself, and his family, and all his possessions, to God. In fervent prayer, in religious instruction, in exemplary deportment, he

leads the young immortals to that Saviour who has said, "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not." He remembers the obvious duty, the express injunction, to bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. But how can all this involve its being right and proper to perform on them, in their unconscious infancy, an act which our Lord appointed for their conscious reception and perpetual remembrance, when they become believers?

Doubtless, the *earliest sanctifying influence* for our children is to be desired. But how can this be identified with a ceremony of which, at the time of its being performed, they have no knowledge? Is it not, rather, to be sought by a discreet, affectionate, and Christian care, that, from the first, even before the commencement of direct instruction, and continually, right religious impressions be made on their minds? Is it not to be sought by bringing them, as Timothy was brought, early to know the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make wise unto salvation through faith in Christ? In a word, and above all, in connection with the divinely appointed means of grace, is it not to be sought by earnest and incessant prayer to Him on whom we and our children are dependent for all sanctifying influence?

The discriminating reader must judge for himself what he ought to think respecting the ingenious representation that in 1 Cor. vii. 14 there is a "fundamental idea from which infant baptism was afterwards necessarily developed," although, confessedly, it was not instituted by our Lord, and was unknown to the Apostles.

We rejoice that the distinguished Biblical interpreters who have been mentioned have, in their circumstances, presented so much that is true. If they have failed to

present the whole truth, we need not wonder. We should recollect the difficulty which some of the best of men have had in freeing themselves entirely from the blinding influence of a long-established custom. Even Luther himself, while he rejected transubstantiation, still retained a portion of the old error to which he had been accustomed in regard to the Lord's supper, and zealously maintained *consubstantiation*.

Besides, a small oversight in respect to the connection, or a mistake in respect to the import of a single word or phrase, may lead to serious errors in the interpretation of a passage. Such an oversight and such a mistake, we think, have occurred here. They are as old as the time of some of the ancient Fathers, and have come down to the present age with a kind of traditional sanction. But to us it seems clear, that "the Apostle is" *not* "here treating of the sanctifying influence of the communion between parents and children, by which the children of Christian parents would be distinguished from the children of those who were not Christian," and that the sense in which he uses the term *holy* has been misapprehended.

It seems that some, in the spirit of a scrupulous Judaism, had questioned the propriety of a believer's continuing to live with a wife or a husband that had not become a believer; as if such intimate and conjugal intercourse were defiling. Their view of the matter was very natural to the Jewish converts in the early Christian churches. Even the Apostle Peter, at first, needed special instruction on the subject; and to this he alludes when he says, as recorded in Acts x. 28, "Ye know how that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company, or come unto one that is of another

nation," or not a member of the same religious community ; " but God hath showed me that I should not call any man common or unclean." In harmony with this enlarged Christian view, the Apostle Paul, in the passage before us, says, Let not the believing consort thrust away the yet unbelieving. For the unbelieving husband is sanctified, so that he is not to be regarded as unclean, by the wife ; and the unbelieving wife is sanctified, so that she is not to be regarded as unclean, by the husband.

On another occasion, the Apostle, in his Epistle to Titus (i. 15), utters a sentiment based on the same principle : " Unto the pure all things are pure " ; and in 1 Tim. iv. 4, 5 : " Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving ; for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer." He proceeds still further to illustrate the propriety of the course that he enjoins. Addressing the Corinthian Church, he says : *Else*, that is, if the representation which I have given be not correct, if the yet unbelieving, and, of course, unbaptized wife or husband must be regarded as unclean, and therefore must be abandoned,— then, by parity of reasoning, *your own children are unclean* and must be abandoned. The little ones, because they are not yet believers, must not even touch their own Christian parents ! Your very infants must not be pressed to the bosoms of their own Christian mothers ! *But now* such absurdity is obvious ; *but now* it is manifest that, instead of being unclean, *they are holy or clean* : they are objects suitable to be ministered to and cherished in all the endearing intercourse of domestic life, according to the ar-

rangements of God for the temporal and spiritual welfare of families.

The word rendered *holy* (*ἅγια*) stands in opposition to the word rendered *unclean* (*ἀκάθαρτα*) ; and this fact suggests the true explanation of the passage. So it was understood by the author of the most ancient Syriac version, made as early at least as in the second century. He uses here a word (*━━━?*) signifying *pure*,— the proper antithesis of *unclean*, in the sense in which the Apostle Peter had been taught to call no man unclean.

The Greek epithet given to the children, in this latter clause, is employed in Lev. x. 14 by the authors of the Septuagint version to express the sense of the Hebrew word (*טָהוֹר*) which in our common version is there rendered *clean*. Under the ancient dispensation, certain parts of the victims offered as sacrifices were to be eaten by the priest and his family *in a clean place* (*בְּקֻדָּם טָהוֹר*, *ἐν τόπῳ ἀγίῳ*), i. e. manifestly, in a place free from all contaminating impurity. Instances might be mentioned in which the Hebrew adjective commonly translated *holy* (*קָדוֹשׁ*), or the verb from which it has been derived, is used to express the idea, not of moral or religious holiness, but of freedom from some physical impurity or ceremonial unfitness, or from that state in which contact or intercourse was conceived to be improper. In such instances the corresponding Greek words in the Septuagint have the same latitude of signification. And no one will deny that the style of the Hebrew original and of that Greek version of the Old Testament has had great influence on the style of the New Testament.

The kindred expression, *is sanctified* (*ἱγ्यαιοῦται*), used in connection with the unbelieving consort, attributes as

much holiness, and holiness of the same kind, to that consort, as are attributed to the children of the Corinthian Christians. The holiness, in both cases, is freedom from such a state as would render family intercourse improper. As it did not imply the baptism of the consort not yet having faith in Christ, so it did not imply the baptism of the children not yet having faith in Christ. On the contrary, the reasoning of the Apostle, all must perceive, proceeds on the assumption that the children referred to were not yet numbered among the believers, as all persons were who had been baptized.

Having shown that the scrupulosity which would prompt to the abandonment of an unbelieving consort is unreasonable, the Apostle closes the discussion by the affecting appeal: “For what knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband? or how knowest thou, O man, whether thou shalt save thy wife?”—as much as to say, Since, therefore, there is no valid hinderance to thy living with thine unbelieving consort, use thine opportunities most wisely. Thou mayest well hope to win the precious soul to the Saviour and to heaven.]

It would lead to needless repetition to multiply citations like those which have been presented in this article. Numerous other names, hardly less distinguished, not only in this particular department of learning, but in other kindred branches, offer themselves as witnesses to the same effect. The object does not require us to extend the enumeration. The extracts presented above may be taken as exhibiting the prevalent view of the ablest authorities, at the present time, in regard

to the question here discussed. We are authorized to say, that the opinion that infant baptism has any legitimate sanction from any passage in the New Testament is no longer a tenable opinion at the bar of Biblical Criticism.

THE

IMPORTANCE OF UNDERSTANDING THE
DESIGN OF BAPTISM,

SUGGESTED

IN A SKETCH, BY THE EDITOR,

RELATIVE TO

THE DOGMA OF BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

A SKETCH RELATIVE TO THE DOGMA OF BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

CONTROVERSIES respecting baptism are not likely to cease, till the purpose for which it was instituted be perceived and duly appreciated. If this be overlooked, or misconceived, entirely or partially, error will ensue, which some may deem it their duty to oppose. The error may be the source of many other errors. It may introduce hurtful inconsistencies. It may endanger the purity, and diminish the efficacy of the Gospel ; or it may even vitiate a whole system of theology, and lead millions of the human family to delusive hopes of eternal life.

Early in the fourteenth century,—it was in the year 1311,—Pope Clement V., in the Council at Vienna, issued the following decree, which was incorporated into the Canon Law for the spiritual guidance of all Christendom : “ Baptism once administered in water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, we believe to be, both for adults and for little ones, a perfect remedy unto salvation. But as to the effect, since theologians have various opinions,—some saying that to little ones sin is remitted, but that grace is not given ; others, on the contrary, asserting

that in baptism both sin is remitted to them, and virtues and transforming grace are infused as to *habit*, although not for that time as to the *use*,— we, taking into view the general efficacy of the death of Christ, *which by baptism is applied equally to all the baptized*, have, with the approbation of the holy Council, pronounced in favor of the second opinion as the more probable and more consonant with the teachings of the saints and of the modern doctors of theology ; the opinion that in baptism are conferred on little ones and on adults transforming grace and virtues.”

According to Cardinal Bellarmine, who was a distinguished member of the Council of Trent, “ Baptism produces three effects : first, it takes away and truly blots out all sin and punishment ; secondly, it confers by the act performed (*ex opere operato*) grace and divine gifts, by which truly and formally a person is justified ; and thirdly, it impresses an indelible character.”

The Roman Catechism, composed by decree of the Council of Trent, and in 1566 published by the authority of Pope Pius V., teaches that “ by baptism we are regenerated in Christ ”; that “ such is the admirable efficacy of this sacrament, as to remit original sin and actual guilt however enormous,” and “ to replenish our souls with divine grace, by which we are made heirs to the inheritance of eternal life ”; that “ the law of baptism, as established by our Lord, extends to all, insomuch that, unless they are regenerated through the grace of baptism, be their parents Christians or infidels, they are born to eternal misery and everlasting destruction ”; that “ baptism may be administered by immersion, infusion, or aspersion ; and that administered in either of these forms, it is equally valid.”

Luther and his associates in the Reformation declared, in 1530, their views on the subject by the ninth article of the Augsburg Confession, which reads thus : “ Concerning baptism, they teach that it is necessary to salvation, and that by baptism the grace of God is presented ; and that children are to be baptized, who, being offered to God by baptism, are received into the grace of God. They condemn the Anabaptists ; who oppose the baptism of children, and affirm that children are saved without baptism.”

It is remarked by Münscher, in his History of Doctrines, that Luther considered baptism as having been less corrupted by the Papists than other parts of the Christian religion : the only change which he deemed it important to make, was to ascribe to faith what they ascribed to the external act performed. And this remark seems to be confirmed by the record of a conference, held at Wittenberg, in 1536, by him and some of his followers, with Bucer, afterwards Professor of Divinity at Oxford, and other theologians who had maintained the Reformed doctrine or that of Zwingle, respecting Baptism and the Lord’s Supper ; a conference which led Bucer so to modify his former representations as to exhibit more strongly the benefits of baptism. “ When we were again assembled together in the morning,” it is stated by one who was present, “ Dr. Luther proposed three things to us relative to baptism. Since there are many who will not baptize infants ; others also are found, who indeed permit them to be baptized, but maintain that baptism itself is only a naked sign, and therefore would suffer infants to die without baptism ; others, lastly, baptize without water ; therefore he thought that we ought to declare our belief

on these points. But what he thought ought to be done he explained beforehand, namely, that infants are to be baptized, and that that baptism is truly efficacious, and confers the adoption of the sons of God.” Luther, it ought to be borne in mind, supposed that by the power of God faith is *infused* into infants, according to their measure and proportion, in answer to the prayer of the Church presenting them in baptism and believing.*

The Helvetic or Swiss Confession of 1536 expresses itself thus: “Baptism is by the institution of the Lord the laver of regeneration, which regeneration the Lord gives to his elect by a visible sign through the ministry of the Church. With which holy laver we therefore baptize our infants; because it is impious to reject from the communion of the people of God those who are sprung from us his people, and are all but pointed out for this by the divine voice, especially since we ought piously to presume of their election.” The Helvetic Confession of 1566 says: “To be baptized in the name of Christ is . . . to be entitled a son of God, to be cleansed also from the pollution of our sins, and to be endued with the manifold grace of God.”

The Genevan Catechism, from the pen of Calvin, in 1545, presents the interrogation, “Do you think the water to be the laver of the soul?” “By no means,” it is replied. “For it is impious to take this honor from the blood of Christ, which was shed that, all our stains being cleansed away, it might make us pure and unpolluted before God. And we perceive the fruit of this purification when the Holy Spirit sprinkles our consciences with that blood. Yet in baptism we have the

* See D'Aubigné's History of the Reformation, B. VI. c. 6.

seal [of these benefits].” “ But,” the interrogator proceeds, “ do you attribute nothing to the water, except that it is a figure of the ablution ? ” And the reply is given : “ I think it to be *so* a figure, that at the same time the reality is annexed. For God, in promising to us his gifts, does not deceive us. Hence it is certain that in baptism both the forgiveness of sins and newness of life are offered to us and received by us.” “ How,” it is further asked, “ are these benefits conferred on us by baptism ? ” And it is replied, “ Because,—unless, by rejecting the promises therein presented to us, we render them unproductive,—we come to be in Christ, and are endowed with his spirit.”

The Confession of Faith published in 1561, by the Reformed churches of France, declares : “ We believe that in baptism God really, that is, truly and efficaciously, gives us whatever he there sacramentally shadows forth ; and therefore we connect with the sign the true possession and enjoyment of that thing which is there offered to us.”

The Heidelberg Catechism, sent forth under the auspices of the highest civil authority, in 1563, asks in its sixty-ninth question : “ On what ground art thou in baptism admonished and assured that thou art a partaker of the one sacrifice of Christ ? ” And it replies, “ Because Christ commanded the external washing of water, this assurance being added, that I am not less certainly washed by his blood and spirit from the pollution of the soul, that is, from all my sins, than I am externally washed with water, with which pollutions of the body are wont to be cleansed away.”

The Confession of Faith, prepared chiefly by John Knox, and adopted by the Church of Scotland in 1560,

holds the following language : “ The vanity of those who affirm that the sacraments are mere signs, we entirely condemn. Nay, rather, we firmly believe that by baptism we are inserted into Jesus Christ, and are made partakers of his righteousness ; by which all our sins are covered and remitted.”

The twenty-seventh of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, adopted in 1562, reads thus : “ Baptism is not only a sign of profession and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened ; but is also a sign of regeneration or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the Church : the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed : faith is confirmed, and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God. The baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ.” In the office for the ministration of the public baptism of infants, the minister is directed to say in prayer to God : “ We call upon Thee for this infant, that he, coming to thy holy baptism, may receive remission of sin by spiritual regeneration.” After the baptism, he is thus to exhort the people : “ Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that this child is regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ’s Church, let us give thanks unto Almighty God for these benefits, and with one accord make our prayers unto him, that this child may lead the rest of his life according to this beginning.” And then he is to say, “ We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this infant with thy Holy Spirit, to receive him for thine

own child by adoption, and to incorporate him into thy holy Church." Accordingly, in the Catechism the child is taught to say, in reference to baptism, "Wherein I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven."

When we recollect the facts in ecclesiastical history to which we have now briefly adverted, we cannot be much surprised, if, in our own times, Mr. Alexander Campbell and his zealous followers have represented baptism as "the remitting ordinance of the gospel, or the appointed means through which the penitent sinner obtains an assurance of that pardon, or remission of sins, procured for him by the sufferings and death of Christ"; or if the Mormons maintain as an article of their faith "baptism for the remission of sins"; or if the Oxford Tractarians exhibit in their theory of the sacraments a deep tinge of Popish error.

Respecting baptismal regeneration, differences of opinion in the Church of England as by law established, and elsewhere, have not been brought to a close. The case of the Rev. Mr. Gorham against the Bishop of Exeter has excited much attention. That clergyman did not hold to the *unconditional* regeneration of infants in baptism. The Bishop refused to institute him as vicar of Bramford Speke, in the diocese of Exeter. Mr. Gorham appealed to the Arches Court of Canterbury, which decided in favor of the Bishop; and, moreover, condemned Mr. Gorham in costs. Mr. Gorham then appealed to her Majesty in council. The Queen referred the case to the Judicial Committee, and directed the Archbishops of Canterbury and of York and the Bishop of London to attend the hearing. This occupied six days, in December, 1849.

In the plea for Mr. Gorham, the following considerations among others were stated : "He held that baptism was a change in the condition, but not in the nature, of man ; that spiritual regeneration was the gift of the Almighty, which might be given before, in, or after baptism, as God pleased ; that if infants receive baptism rightly, by which he meant worthily, grace must have been conferred before or at baptism ; that in such case baptism is the sign of regeneration, and infants are grafted into the Church, and entitled to the promises made according to the 27th of the articles of Religion ; that if, on the other hand, infants do not receive baptism rightly, their baptism has no immediate spiritual effect ; and that worthiness of reception is required to the effectual operation of the Holy Spirit."

On the part of the Bishop it was replied : "We contend that baptism is an unconditional regeneration. . . . Irenæus spoke of baptism and regeneration as convertible terms. Pope Innocent IV. held the same opinion ; and, from the letters of Clement V., it is manifest that on this point there has never been any difference between the primitive Church, the Church of Rome, and the Church of England. . . . It is the opinion of the Church, expressed by the highest authorities, that the words of the priest, in the administration of baptism, were the words of God, and that when he put his hands upon the child its new birth was effected."

On the 8th of March, 1850, judgment was delivered reversing the decision of the Arches Court, and maintaining that Mr. Gorham's opinion "is not contrary or repugnant to the declared doctrine of the Church of England as by law established." In this judgment it is stated : "There are points of doctrine, respecting

the sacrament of baptism, which we are of opinion are, by the rubrics and formularies, as well as the articles, capable of being honestly understood in different senses ; and consequently we think that, as to them, the points which were left undetermined by the articles are not decided by the rubrics and formularies, and that upon these points all ministers of the Church, having duly made the subscriptions required by law, and taking Holy Scripture for their guide, are at liberty honestly to exercise their private judgment without offence or censure. . . . Mr. Gorham's doctrine may be contrary to the opinion entertained by many learned and pious persons,—contrary to the opinion which such persons have, by their own particular studies, deduced from Holy Scripture,—contrary to the opinion which they have deduced from the usages and doctrines of the primitive Church,—or contrary to the opinion which they have deduced from uncertain and ambiguous expressions in the formularies ; still, if the doctrine of Mr. Gorham is not contrary or repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England as by law established, it cannot afford a legal ground for refusing him institution to the living to which he has been lawfully presented. This court, constituted for the purpose of advising her Majesty in matters which come within its competency, has no jurisdiction or authority to settle matters of faith, or to determine what ought in any particular to be the doctrine of the Church of England. Its duty extends only to the consideration of that which is by law established to be the doctrine of the Church of England, upon the true and legal construction of her articles and formularies ; and we consider that it is not

the duty of any court to be minute and rigid in cases of this sort.” *

The Vice-Chancellor was the only member present of the Judicial Committee that dissented from the decision of the case thus heard and determined by the Judicial Committee and the Lords of the Privy Council. It was approved by the Archbishops of Canterbury and of York; but the Bishop of London did not concur.

The Bishop of Exeter, with a zeal worthy of a better cause, has recently summoned a numerous synod or council in his diocese, and, with their concurrence, he has re-affirmed his doctrine of baptismal regeneration in the following, among other declarations: “We hold that all infants presented either in church or privately, according to the Book of Common Prayer, and baptized with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, do in and by baptism ‘receive remission of sins by spiritual regeneration,’ and are made members of Christ, being spiritually ingrafted and incorporated into Christ’s mystical body; original sin being so far from an obstacle to the right reception of baptism, that, as St. Augustine says, ‘infants, because they are not as yet guilty of any actual sin, have the original sin that is in them remitted through the grace of Him who saveth by the washing of regeneration.’ And, as our own Church declares, the baptized child, ‘being born in original sin, and in the wrath of God, is by the laver of regeneration in baptism received

* A full and authentic statement of the pleadings and of the decision may be found in “Reports of Cases in the House of Lords, the Privy Council, the Courts of Equity and Common Law, and in the Admiralty and Ecclesiastical Courts, during the Years 1850 and 1851.”

into the number of the children of God, and heirs of everlasting life ; for our Lord Jesus Christ doth not deny his grace and mercy unto such infants, but most lovingly calls them unto him.' And in accordance here-with, the 27th article expressly says, that 'the baptism of young children is most agreeable with the institution of Christ.' Without presuming to define whether it may not please God to give a larger measure of grace in baptism to some infants, in answer to the more earnest prayer of those who bring them, we hold, that, if any shall affirm that the imparting of the aforesaid graces in the baptism of young children is hypothetical, depending either on the sincerity of those who present them, or on any other conditions, (whereupon it follows, that in cases in which the said conditions do not take place, both the form of baptism itself, and the article 'One baptism for the remission of sins,' must be understood not as true, but as false and unreal,) he doth greatly err, contradicting an article of the Creed, and also the commission and promise given to the Apostles by our Lord himself."

While the special controversy to which reference has been made was proceeding, there appeared, among many other publications on the subject, a large volume by a highly respectable clergyman of the Establishment, the Rev. William Goode, which he entitles, "The Doctrine of the Church of England as to the Effects of Baptism in the case of Infants"; and this able work, probably, had no small influence in producing the decision so favorable to Mr. Gorham. But conscientious ministers of Christ will hardly be satisfied with the hypothetical theory ; and they will desire to know, not so much what is the doctrine of the Church of England,

as what is the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures.. Would that the accomplished author, and all men of every religious communion, might ever remember the leading principles of an earlier work of his, "The Divine Rule of Faith and Practice"! An auspicious event, too, it would be for all concerned, if they would free themselves from the unhappy influence of the long-continued habit of denying that Baptism and the Lord's Supper are in themselves mere signs. Not, indeed, that these observances are to be undervalued or despised and neglected as the useless "form of a form"; for they are to be duly and devoutly regarded as signs full of meaning and expression, and appointed for our spiritual benefit by the Highest Authority.

But it is easier to perceive the errors of others than to correct our own. And it is easier to adopt a truly Christian theory of religion and its ordinances, than to lead a truly Christian life. The holiest truth itself, uttered not only in words, but also in a divinely authorized and most suitable rite, will be of little avail to any of us, if it do not bring forth in our hearts and in our lives the fruits of holiness.

THE END.

g w







AUG 18 1992

